EVEL
ONE

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 649-2500

VOLUME IV NUMBER 3

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JULY 1930

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1929-30
Silas Hertzler

MENNO SIMONS ON THE INCARNATION II
Irvin E. Burkhart

A HYMN OF THE SWISS BRETHREN
Christian Neff

THE VALUE OF HYMNS FOR MENNONITE HISTORY
Ernst Correll

REVIEWS AND NOTES

PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE

$1.00 a Year 35 cents a Copy

LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Seminary Knolls
Covina, California

Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des oberdeutschen Täufertums im 16. Jahrhundert

Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung von 1542

Herausgegeben von

J. Loserth

Am 23. April 1929 waren es 400 Jahre, daß das erste Reichsgesetz gegen die „Wiedertäufer" auf dem Reichstag zu Speyer beschlossen wurde. Dieses Gesetz bedrohte jedermann mit Todesstrafe, der die Taufe auf den Glauben forderte. Mehrere tausend Männer und Frauen, gläubige Christen, auch Jugendliche, wurden hingerichtet. Die Geschichte der Taufgesinnten ist reich an erschütternden Beispielen edlen Märtyrertums, dem erst die Geschichtschreibung der Gegenwart die verdiente Würdigung schenkte.

Es ist daher von Bedeutung, die religiöse Stellung der Angeschuldigten aus ihren Schriften zu hören. In den Kreisen des süddeutschen Täufertums sind während der Herrschaft des Speyerer „Wiedertäufergesetzes" nur zwei Werke erschienen, die Pilgram Marbeck zum Verfasser haben: Die „Vermahnung" und die „Testamentserläuterung". Sie sind aber ohne Angabe seines Namens veröffentlicht worden. Da die Behörden vernichteten, was ihnen davon in die Hände fiel, zählen diese Schriften heute zu den größten Seltenheiten.

Den Ausgangspunkt jener Veröffentlichungen bildete Marbecks Vermahnung (1542), die in der „Gedenkschrift zum 400jährigen Jubiläum der Taufgesinnten oder Mennoniten" (1925) neu herausgegeben wurde. Sie veranlaßte den Reformator Kaspar von Schwenckfeld zu einer Erwiderung, auf die Marbeck unter Mitwirkung der Aeltesten der süddeutschen und schweizerischen Taufgesinntengemeinden eine umfangreiche Entgegnung: „Verantwortung über Casparn Schwenckfelds Judicium" schrieb. Diese Antwort wurde handschriftlich verbreitet und ist noch in den Bibliotheken zu München, Zürich und Olmütz erhalten. In der Literatur wurde sie bisher nur wenig beachtet; sie bietet aber eine Fülle neuen Stoffes zur Beurteilung der Taufgesinnten im Reformationszeitalter. Ihre Veröffentlichung darf daher als ein wertvoller Beitrag zur Geschichte des oberdeutschen Täufertums bezeichnet werden.

Das Werk ist soeben erschienen. Es umfaßt 600 Druckseiten und kann bei dem Unterzeichneten zum Preis von 25 Mark bezogen werden. Bei größeren Bestellungen an eine Adresse wird auf je 10 Bände ein Freiexemplar gewährt.

Christian Hege

Frankfurt a. M., im Juli 1929
Rothschildallee 33

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Editor-in-Chief
HAROLD S. BENDER

Associate Editors

ERNST CORRELL
GUY F. HERSHBERGER
CHRISTIAN NEFF
JOHN UMBLE
BENJAMIN H. UNRUH
EDWARD YODER

VOLUME IV JULY 1930 NUMBER 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1929-30
Silas Hertzler

MENNO SIMONS ON THE INCARNATION II
Irvin E. Burkhart

A HYMN OF THE SWISS BRETHREN
Christian Neff

THE VALUE OF HYMNS FOR MENNONITE HISTORY
Ernst Correll

REVIEWS AND NOTES

A Quarterly Journal
PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE
SANFORD CALVIN YODER, *President*
PUBLICATION OFFICE: SCOTTDALE, PENNSYLVANIA
EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE: GOSHEN, INDIANA

The Price of the Mennonite Quarterly Review is One Dollar a year, prepaid in American Territory, in Canada, and Mexico. For all other countries add twenty-five cents postage. Single copies, thirty-five cents postpaid. Subscriptions should be sent to The Mennonite Quarterly Review, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, or Goshen, Indiana.

Request for transfer as second-class matter from Goshen, Indiana to Scottdale, Pennsylvania, is pending.

Printed in U. S. A

R289.705
M547

VOLUME IV NUMBER 3

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JULY 1930

EDITORIAL

READERS OF THE REVIEW WILL RECALL THE VERY INFORMING article on attendance in Mennonite schools and colleges in 1928 which appeared in the July, 1929, issue. This study by Dr. Hertzler, head of the department of education in Goshen College, was an attempt to analyze, statistically, the enrollment in all Mennonite institutions of learning in the United States and Canada. The report was very satisfactory and enlightening; but it was also somewhat incomplete inasmuch as statistics from a number of institutions were unavailable. Furthermore, this report contained an analysis of the enrollment during the first semester only of the school year 1928-1929. The present report contains complete attendance statistics for an entire school year including the summer session of 1929 and the regular academic year 1929-1930. Fortunately the data are also much more complete in this that practically all of the schools responded to the author's questionnaire. Only one or two of the smaller academies failed to do so. There are several tables in this report not found in that of last year; this also adds to the usefulness of the study. It is hoped that the Mennonite schools of America will continue to co-operate with Dr. Hertzler as it is the plan to make this an annual feature of the REVIEW. It is needless to suggest that the student of Mennonite life can hardly find a more fruitful field for study than the development of education, particularly higher education as represented in the various colleges and academies operated by the Mennonites of America.

The second article in this issue is the second and concluding installment of Professor Burkhart's study on Menno Simons' views regarding the incarnation. While Menno was not a great theologian and while most Mennonites do not follow him in his views on the incarnation to-day it is highly significant, as Burkhart points out, that Menno can be regarded as an apostle of piety even as Luther was the apostle of justification by faith. The Mennonite view of life has attempted through four centuries to effect a happy combination of Christian doctrine and life and it is significant to find evidences of this attempt even in Menno's views on so mysterious a verity as the incarnation of Jesus of Nazareth.

It was Martin Luther who created the type of Christian hymn known as the "martyr hymn" on the occasion of the martyrdom of the first two evangelical martyrs in Flanders in 1522. But it was the Anabaptists who developed this form of the Christian hymn to the fullest, particularly the Swiss and Hutterite Brethren. The *Ausbund* is to a large extent made up of such hymns. That the type was being written as late as the end of the 17th century is evidenced by the "Zürich-Lied" which is presented to us by Dr. Christian Neff in this issue. The "Zürich-Lied" is a document of unusual interest, and of a vivid freshness that makes a powerful impression even in this dulled generation. The references to the persecution in Zürich without doubt refer to the last great tribulation of the Brethren in the first half or the 17th century, particularly in the period from 1635-1645. A first-hand account of this tribulation is contained in the appendix to the editions of the *Ausbund* published after this date. The hymn speaks for itself. It is presented in its original rough peasant Swiss German, unedited and untranslated. It might be remembered that it was written about the time that the first Mennonite settlement in Pennsylvania was being made.

A number of scholars in the field of Anabaptist and Mennonite history have called attention to the importance of the hymns of these people as essential to an understanding of their life and thought. Readers of the Review will recall the valuable contribution of this type by Dr. Albert J. Ramaker in the April issue of 1929. Professor Ernst Correll whose scholarly work in this field is well known follows the "Zürich-Lied" presented by Dr. Neff with an informing discussion on the value of hymns for an understanding of Mennonite history. In the course of his researches on

the Swiss Anabaptists he has had ample occasion to appreciate the significance of this type of historical evidence.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

SILAS HERTZLER: Professor of Education, Goshen College

IRVIN E. BURKHART: Professor of Theology, Hesston College

CHRISTIAN NEFF: Mennonite Leader, Author, Historian, Weierhof, Germany

ERNST CORRELL: Professor of Economic History, Graduate School, American University

HAROLD S. BENDER: Professor of Church Hstory, Goshen College

RUTH BENDER: Instructor in Hesston College

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1929-30

SILAS HERTZLER

The study of attendance in Mennonite schools and colleges, reported this year, has been so planned that it represents the total attendance for the school year 1929-30, together with the summer of 1929. The study reported in the July, 1929, issue of the REVIEW was less inclusive. This time the work was begun early so as to give ample time for reports from all Mennonite schools. Continued effort was made to secure the necessary data, in order to make the report complete. However, no data were secured from at least two of the smaller Mennonite academies. It is to be hoped that the cooperation of these schools may be secured by next year.

Questionnaires were sent to and replies were received from twelve Mennonite schools. These are, Witmarsum Theological Seminary, Bluffton, Ohio; Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio; Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana; Bethel College, Newton, Kansas; Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas; Hesston College and Bible School, Hesston, Kansas; Eastern Mennonite School, Harrisonburg, Virginia; Freeman Junior College, Freeman, South Dakota; Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Gretna, Manitoba; German-English Academy, Rosthern, Saskatchewan; Zoar Academy and Bible School, Inman, Kansas; and Reedley Bible School, Reedley, California. An effort was made to secure attendance statistics from the Mennonite Academy in Winkler, Manitoba, and from the Oklahoma Bible Academy at Meno, Oklahoma, but no replies were received. The writer feels encouraged that replies were received from three schools this year, which did not report last year. However, the net total is only two schools additional, since no data were secured from one school which did report last year.

Table I summarizes the attendance in the Mennonite schools and colleges of the United States and Canada. The attendance for the year, including the summer of 1929, makes a total of 1967 students. Of this number 11 were graduate students, 1074 were college students, 609 were academy or high school students, with 273 from all other departments. One hundred thirty-nine of this last list of unclassified students were special Bible term students

for six weeks only, at the Eastern Mennonite School, at Goshen College, and at Hesston College. Fifty-three were music and art students at Bluffton College. This number, at Bluffton, is the number taking music and art only, and not otherwise registered in the college, for Bluffton reports a grand total, for the year, of 83 music students and 10 art students. Tabor College listed their 35 summer students separately, and did not count them in the totals for college and academy. Summer students were included with the college and academy statistics at the other institutions reporting. Freeman Junior College conducted a twelve-week special Bible term, with 19 students. These are included in their report of 46 music and Bible students.

Tables II and III give summarizations by classes. Both academy and college are included. However, a part of the summer students, some music and art students, special Bible students, and a few others are not included in this classification. This is true also for evening students, extension students, and other specials at several of the schools. A total of 342 students is thus not accounted for in the classified list.

A brief analysis of the size of the classes in the different institutions may be of value. The classes at Bluffton run more nearly parallel in size than at any other of our colleges. The three upper classes are of almost exactly the same size. The numbers are, seniors 49; juniors 43; and sophomores 49. Bluffton seems to succeed well in holding her students throughout the full four years of the college course. Her freshman class is smaller though than those of Goshen and Bethel. The junior and senior classes at Bethel and at Goshen are notably smaller in proportion to the freshman and sophomore years than one would expect judging from the standard set at Bluffton. If this means merely a healthy growth, with the starting in of students at the beginning, who can be held throughout the course, both these institutions should soon have considerably larger junior and senior classes.

The largest academy classes are again at the Eastern Mennonite School, though the academy classes at Hesston and at Tabor are almost as large. A four-year academy course is also offered at Freeman, at Rosthern, and at Goshen. The full academy course is completed in three years at Gretna. The reports from Reedley, California, and from Inman, Kansas, indicate that only the first two years of academy work are offered there.

Table X points out the certificates, diplomas and degrees

granted by the different Mennonite institutions in June, 1929. Considerable variety is represented by the group of certificates and diplomas given. A few were given for work completed in such courses as bookkeeping, music, Bible and normal work. Zoar Academy gave certificates upon completion of a two-year academy course. Junior college diplomas were given at three institutions. Academy graduates outnumber those receiving degrees. This may surprise some of us, though the academy graduating classes are smaller now than formerly, and the degree classes are larger. Three different bachelor's degrees were offered in 1929, Th. B., B. S. in Education, and B. A. The academic B. A. degree seems most popular, for 95 of the 100 degrees granted were the B. A. The Bachelor of Divinity degree also was conferred upon 4 graduates at Witmarsum Theological Seminary.

The total number of Mennonite students in the institutions reporting was 1259. Over 79 per cent. of these students were "old" Mennonites and General Conference Mennonites. Many of the remainder were members of the Brueder-Gemeinde and Central Conference groups. In all, students from ten different groups of Mennonites attended the Mennonite schools during the year. Table IV gives these details.

Members of 22 other Christian denominations attended Mennonite schools during this time, besides two Hebrew students. There was one Christian who did not specify the denomination to which he belonged, along with 40 who were members of no church at all. As in the report last year the Methodist church had the largest number of representatives, with 64 students in six different institutions. There were 28 Evangelical and 29 Presbyterian students. Other Christian groups represented by comparatively large numbers were Lutheran, Christian, Baptist, Reformed and Brethren. The remaining 14 religious bodies had fewer representatives. This analysis is given in Table V.

Adding together the 1259 Mennonites and the 319 non-Mennonites, the total is 1578. This leaves 389 students of the total number attending, who are not included. This is due to incompleteness in the returns. For example, Bluffton classified by denominations only the 232 students who attended college during the school year, and did not include the 86 students who attended summer school; neither were all the music and art students included in this group. The same plan was followed by the Eastern Mennonite School, where 111 students who attended their special Bible term

were not classified as to denominational affiliation. Another large group unclassified as to this point was the summer school attendance at Tabor. Sufficient other omissions occurred to make the difference above mentioned.

Tables VI and VII give the states and countries from which the students come who attend the Mennonite schools. Among Mennonite students the number of states, provinces, and countries represented is approximately the same as last year. Twenty-nine different states and four Canadian provinces send students to these schools. The foreign countries represented are India, China, Mexico and Russia. Reports were received for 1279 Mennonite students.

Table IV gives a total of 1259 Mennonite students, while Table VI gives the homes of 1279. This difference is due to a slight misunderstanding of the questionnaire, by several of the institutions concerned. The tables represent the statistics sent in answer to the questionnaire.

Table VII is a compilation representing the homes of the non-Mennonite students. Here are represented 16 states, the Philippine Islands, Manitoba, Germany and India. The total of 278 given in this table is 41 less than the number given by denominations in Table V. This is due in part to the fact that one school did not report the states from which non-Mennonites came, but did report the students by denominational affiliation.

Tables VIII, IX, and X tabulate facts not given in last year's report. The writer felt that it would be of interest and of value to know the summer school attendance; the proportions represented by men students and by women students; and the number of certificates, diplomas, and degrees granted. These tables summarize the facts reported.

The writer feels grateful to all who have aided by giving facts concerning the institutions reported upon. At this time he wishes again to ask that if any one knows of a Mennonite academy not included in the study it will be helpful to have this information by the time the next annual study is begun, about February 15, 1931.

Table I

Enrollment in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30

School	Total Enrollment	Graduate Students	College	Junior College	Academy	Other Depts.
Witmarsum	22	11	11			
Bluffton	371[5]		318			53[1]
Goshen	324		248		55	21[2]
Bethel	287		287			
E. M. S.	254			35	108	111[2]
Tabor	198		65		98	35[3]
Hesston	188			69	112	7[2]
Freeman	139			27	66	46[4]
Rosthern	75				75	
Gretna	54		14		40	
Reedley	35				35	
Zoar	20				20	
Total	1967	11	943	131	609	273

[1] *Music and Art students.*
[2] *Special Bible Term students.*
[3] *Summer students.*
[4] *Music and Bible students.*
[5] *Bluffton College Bulletin,* February, 1930, p. 144.

Table II

Enrollment by Classes, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30
Graduate Students, College and Junior College Students

School	Graduate Students	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Unclassified Students	Total
Witmarsum	11	2	3	3	3		22
Bluffton		49	43	49	71	20	232
Goshen		31	30	44	90	21	216
Bethel		22	14	57	100	14	207
Tabor		6	14	20	20	5	65
Hesston		2	5	14	34	7	62
E. M. S.			1	9	20	5	35
Freeman				6	21		27
Gretna					14		14
Total	11	112	110	202	373	72	880

Table III

Enrollment by Classes, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30
Academy Students

School	Seniors	Juniors	Sopho-mores	Freshmen	Special Bible Term	Specials	Summer School	Total
E. M. S.	39	22	24	20	96	3		204
Hesston	26	26	23	25	19	1		120
Tabor	27	30	20	15		6		98
Freeman	17	10	15	24	19			85
Rosthern	19	14	23	19				75
Goshen	12	6	4	4	27		15	68
Gretna	12	10	18					40
Reedley			15	20				35
Zoar			9	11				20
Bethel							13	
Total	152	118	158	138	161	10	28	745

Table IV

Mennonite Students in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30

	Witmarsum	Goshen	Hesston	E. M. S.	Bethel	Bluffton	Tabor	Freeman	Rosthern	Reedley	Zoar	Gretna	Total
American Mennonites		226	139	152	3	12	13	1					546
General Conf. Mennonites	6	2	22		143	89	6	70	59		5	50	452
Brueder Gemeinde							92	13	14	24	3		146
Krimmer Brueder Gemeinde					1		21	16		11	12		61
Central Conf. Mennonites	1	11				29							41
Defenceless Mennonites						2							2
Conservative Amish Men.				3									3
Defenceless Men. of N. A.							1	3					4
Men. Brethren in Christ								1					1
Reformed Mennonites	1												1
Mennonite Unclassified		1				1							2
Total	8	240	161	155	147	133	133	104	73	35	20	50	1259

Table V

Non-Mennonite Students in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30

	Witmarsum	Bluffton	Goshen	Bethel	Tabor	Hesston	Freeman	E. M. S.	Rosthern	Gretna	Total
Methodist	8	29	15	6	1	5					64
Evangelical		5	3	4	1	13	2				28
Presbyterian	1	11	11	5	1						29
Lutheran	8	4	1				8		1	2	24
Christian	2		2	13		1	1				19
Baptist		3	2	4	9						18
Reformed		13	2				3				18
Brethren		3	19	1				1			24
Roman Catholic		2	4	6	1						13
United Brethren	1	5	1	1							8
Congregational		6		1							7
Episcopalian			4	2							6
Church of Christ		1		2							3
Nazarene				1			2				3
Christian Science		1	2								3
Church of God	1			1							2
Hebrew		1		1							2
River Brethren						1					1
Quaker			1								1
Christian Miss. Alliance			1								1
Swedenborgian									1		1
Moody Church					1						1
Salvation Army					1						1
Unclassified	1		1								2
Non-church members		11	12		15			2			40
Total	22	95	81	48	30	20	16	3	2	2	319

Table VI

States, Provinces, and Countries from which Mennonite Students Come, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30

	Goshen	Witmarsum	Hesston	E. M. S.	Bethel	Bluffton	Tabor	Freeman	Rosthern	Reedley	Zoar	Gretna	Total
Kansas	5	6	81		108		67				20		287
Ohio	71	1	1	7		64							144
South Dakota					1			113					114
Pennsylvania	23		1	67		14							105
Indiana	76	1	2	1		12							92
Saskatchewan						2	2		73			2	79
Virginia	1		2	63									66
Manitoba					1		6					49	56
Illinois	29					20							49
California					1	5	4			35			45
Oklahoma			3		15	2	18						38
Nebraska	1		11		6		13	1					32
Iowa	13		8			9		1					31
Minnesota					4		6	6					16
North Dakota			9		1		2						12
Alberta			7	1		1			2			1	12
Idaho	1		3		6	1							11
India	4						7						11
Missouri			10										10
Oregon			10										10

Michigan	7			2									9
Montana			2	1			5	1					9
Ontario	3		1	3		2							9
Colorado	2		5										7
Delaware				4									4
China							2	1					3
Maryland			1	2									3
Florida				2									2
Mississippi	1			1									2
Texas	2				1								3
Tennessee	1			1									2
Louisiana					1								1
Mexico					1								1
New York			1										1
West Virginia						1							1
Washington					1								1
Russia							1						1
Total	240	8	158	155	147	133	133	123	75	35	20	52	1279

Table VII

States, Provinces, and Countries from which non-Mennonite Students Come,

Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30

	Witmarsum	Bluffton	Goshen	Hesston	Tabor	Freeman	Bethel	E. M. S.	Gretna	Total
Ohio	14	92	3							109
Indiana		2	72							74
Kansas				29	19					48
South Dakota						16				16
Illinois		2						1		3
Nebraska			1		1		1			3
Iowa			1	1	1					3
Manitoba		1							2	3
Pennsylvania			2							2
Germany					2					2
India					2					2
Michigan			1		1					2
Minnesota			1		1					2
Oklahoma					2					2
New Jersey		1	1							2
Delaware		1								1
North Dakota					1					1
Philippine Islands				1						1
Connecticut			1							1
Oregon			1							1
Total	14	99	84	31	30	16	1	1	2	278

Table VIII

Summer Session

Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929

	Men	Women	Total
Bluffton	30	56	86
Bethel	11	59	70
Goshen	25	37	62
Tabor	7	28	35
Grand Totals —	73	180	253

Table IX

Attendance, Men and Women

Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929-30

	Men	Women	Total
Bluffton	172	199	371
Goshen	136	188	324
Bethel	117	170	287
E. M. S.	114	140	254
Tabor	91	107	198
Hesston	80	108	188
Freeman	52	87	139
Rosthern	50	25	75
Gretna	40	14	54
Reedley	16	19	35
Witmarsum	16	6	22
Zoar	11	9	20
Grand Totals	895	1072	1967

Table X

Diplomas Given and Degrees Granted

Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1929

	Zoar	Reedley	Rosthern	Freeman	E. M. S.	Hesston	Tabor	Bethel	Goshen	Bluffton	Witmarsum	Total
Bookkeeping							2					2
Academy*	9											9
Academy†			17	16	20	37	18		22			130
Normal				18								18
Bible		8			4				1			13
Music								1				1
Junior College				4	4	16						24
B. S. in Ed.									3			3
Th. B.							1				1	2
B. A.							5	30	27	33		95
B. D.											4	4
Totals	9	8	17	38	28	53	26	31	53	33	5	301

* Two year course.
† Four year course.

MENNO SIMONS ON THE INCARNATION

(Continued)

Irvin E. Burkhart

III

Up to this point we have considered the personal attitudes of Menno Simons, the recognition given his view of the incarnation, and the definition of the view as deduced from his writings. From the standpoint of history, the next question in order is, where did the view come from, and what historical connections can it be shown to have had? Specific data are not available in large quantities. There are, however, a number of helps that may be of value in the search. The main lines to be followed are the Gnostic sects which have been mentioned by historians as possible backgrounds for Menno's view, a number of the early church fathers mentioned by Menno in his writings, the Reformation sects of Menno's own time, and Menno's own remarks on the subject.

A. *The Supposed Gnostic Origins*

A number of students supposed the source of Menno Simons' view of the incarnation to have been in the Gnosticism of the first and second Christian centuries. That the Gnostics raised the problem of the incarnation is only too true. There were many sects of Gnostics with as many variations of teaching. Whatever the variations, there were three basic principles underlying the whole system of Gnosticism, namely, "a supreme Being, unconnected with matter and incapable of being affected by it; matter, the source of evil, and opposed to the supreme Being; a series of beings intermediate between these two."[1]

We glance first at the inference of S. Cramer[2] who thinks that Menno's view is simply the ancient view of Valentinus, a Gnostic of the second century. The point of contact is supposed to be the method of the birth of Jesus. Cramer, supposing Menno's view to be identical with Melchior Hoffman's,[3] understood Menno to teach that Jesus simply passed through Mary without any vital connection with her body, and in this respect was akin to Valentinus' view. Dosker[2] follows Cramer and says he is "absolutely right." Dosker is no longer living but we must remind his readers that on a question upon which opinions differ so very widely there is little likeli-

hood that anyone is "absolutely right" and all others wrong. It might be that all are partly in the right. But there are good reasons for believing that many are in the wrong on the problem of the origins of the view of Menno Simons as to the incarnation. On this very point Rues[4] said, "The Fleming Mennonites and Menno himself believed that the body of Jesus was created out of nothing, but they guarded themselves against the error of Valentinus by saying that Jesus received his sustenance from the blood of Mary." And, as was earlier remarked, one should consider as a mistake Cramer's assumption that Menno taught that Jesus passed through Mary without any vital connection. The writings of Simons reveal no such statement.

The Messiah, Valentinus said, was born of Mary as water passes through a channel. He was a psychical Messiah, but could be seen and touched. The crucifixion was construed symbolically and the saving process was said to consist in the exaltation of the psychical in man after it was separated from the hylical. The hylical also was not matter but was an emotional substance that was lower than the psychical.[5] There are four points of comparison between the Valentinians and Menno, all of which would be of interest, namely, freedom of the will, the relation of creed to ethics, the concept of the nature of Christ, and the incompatibility of the divine nature and a material body. The first three show no similarity whatever, the fourth does. Valentinus, as all Gnostics, built his system upon the assumed incompatibility of the supreme Being and evil matter. When applied to the body of Christ it involved the union of God with evil matter, and for that reason Valentinus supplied a body of an ethereal kind which had the attributes but not the reality of matter. Now, if there is any connection between Menno's theory of incarnation and that of the Valentinians it is at this point and not, as Cramer holds, on the point of the method of passing through the body of Mary. The Gnostics saw only evil in all matter. Menno did not teach the inherent evil of all things material, but there can be no doubt that he considered all human flesh as evil. He taught that, due to Adam's sin, all flesh is inherently evil.[6]

It seems clear that Menno, because of his belief that all flesh is sinful *per se,* denied the identity in substance of the body of Jesus with Mary's flesh. The question now is not whether Menno and the Gnostics agree, but whether he studied their writings or came into any vital contacts with those holding Gnostic views. It should be remembered that this belief that humanity is sinful has been held through the ages.[7] It might be more correct to say that the Gnostics

derived their principle of the evil of all matter from this older idea of the inherent sinfulness of man. However, in the absence of proof, the question must be left with a recognition of the agreement between Valentinus and Menno, the former teaching that all matter is inherently evil, the latter teaching the same concerning the flesh of man. When applied to Christ's body Valentinus made him of psychic materials having the attributes but not the reality of matter. Menno[8] made him, as pertaining to the body, "truly man, but man of the Adamic type before the fall, without sin." And so the problem of origin remains.

Another hypothesis to demand attention is that of the translator of the writings of Mosheim. He adds a note which says it seems "very probable that this doctrine [Menno's view of the incarnation] was propagated from the Manichaeans."[9] In another note on the same page he asks if it is not probable that "most, if not all, the peculiar sentiments of the old Anabaptists of Germany originated from the influence of that Manichaean leaven which was introduced into Europe in the ninth century by the Paulicians; and which spread far, and produced from that time onward various fanatical and enthusiastic sects quite down to the time of the Reformation?"

The Manichaeans, followers of Manes of the latter third century, A. D., built on the Oriental dualism of the principle of light and good at war with the principle of darkness and evil. The powers of darkness were supposed to have created mortal man from a ray of light which they were supposed to have captured from the principle of good and then distorted. To rescue man, Christ and the Holy Spirit were created. Christ was sent into the world clothed with the shadowy form of the human body, and not with the real substance, to teach mortals how to deliver the rational soul from the corrupt body, and to overcome the power of malignant matter. The spirits of evil seduced men so that they crucified Christ, who in reality could not die. He, however, gave the promise of another Comforter who would complete His plan of salvation.[10]

The Manichaeans also made much of the teaching of Paul when he wrote of the conflict between the flesh and the spirit. They clung to the New Testament, but whatever did not agree with the teachings of Manes was rejected. They also made much of the ethics of Christ as taught by Manes. The soul which struggled against the lust and appetites of a corrupt nature would at death, they said, be delivered from a sinful body and received into the regions of light, but those who neglected to struggle against their

corrupt natures would pass after death into the bodies of animals or other beings, until they had expiated their guilt . . . . The sufferings of Christ on the cross were not considered real, but apparent only. His body was not really human, had no human nature, but only a fantastic semblance of corporeity in which His essence as the Son of Everlasting Light, was presented to the eyes of man.[10]

There are four considerations in the foregoing view that should be compared with the ideas of Menno Simons. To the Manichaeans, Christ had no real human birth; to Menno, "Mary was truly His mother." To them His body was unreal; to Menno, Christ was "very man." To them His human nature was a phantasy; Menno said, Christ gave expression to all the basic emotions of men. To them His sufferings were only apparent; but to Menno the picture of Calvary was a living reality. And so the Manichaean hypothesis goes by the board, except that Manes also, like Valentinus, constructed a theory of the incarnation on the basis of a body that was not composed of matter, matter being evil.

Murdock, the translator of Mosheim's *Institutes,* suggests that the Paulicians furnished the link between the Manichaeans and the Anabaptists. The Paulicians held to the two original Gnostic principles of good and evil, but they combined with this dualism a high value for the universal use of Scripture, a rejection of all external forms in religion, and a special abhorrence for the use of images. McClintock and Strong's *Encyclopedia* denies that they were Manichaean, saying it was only a slanderous charge laid against them by their enemies, and that they were for the most part men who were disgusted with the doctrines and ceremonies of human invention, and were desirous of returning to apostolic doctrine and practice. They do admit, however, that the Paulicians were descended from some of the ancient Gnostic sects. Their philosophic bases are similar to those of the Manichaeans, but they differed widely from them in church government. The Paulicians rejected government by bishops, priests, and deacons, to which the Manichaeans held.[11]

It seems, however, that Harnack[12] has more nearly balanced the evidence. He says, "It is undoubted that the Paulicians were related to the Manichaeans," but, he says, "We should recognize the fact that one group does not take over its entire system from another. The reading of Scripture, of the Fathers, also old reminiscences have, in all ages of the church, given rise to developments in new directions." This, thinks Harnack, is the case of the Paulician connection with the Manichaeans. But whether there is a con-

nection between these two groups or not it seems clear that the Paulicians did not give Menno his idea of the incarnation because they were too close to the Gnostic principles on this point. But in many respects they held the same views on church government as did Menno. Whether or not he received those ideas from them has no bearing on the present discussion. Neither is it necessary to consider the many other variations of Gnosticism such as the teachings of Cerinthus, the Ebionites, Marcion, and others, because they are so similar to the ones mentioned, and also because none of the students of Menno have attributed the origins of his views to them. We pass then to an examination of the early fathers mentioned by Menno in his writings.

B. *Church Fathers Mentioned by Menno Simons*

Scattered throughout the writings of Menno Simons we find the names of numerous early Church Fathers. It is the intention here to examine the writings of all those named in order to determine their attitude on the incarnation. They are mentioned in connection with the discussion of such topics as repentance, the Lord's Supper, infant and adult baptism, the Trinity, the relation of the magistracy to the teaching of the church, swearing of oaths. Some of them are mentioned in discussing the incarnation. They are not, however, mentioned by Menno in substantiation of his view of the incarnation. However, in spite of this, it seems necessary to consider this early period in order to make sure whether or not the idea may have been held at that time by any of those to whom reference was made by Menno in his writings. We note first the Ante-Nicene group.

Tertullian[13] (145-220 A. D.), North African bishop of Carthage, has written very voluminously on the person of Christ, especially his humanity. This arose out of his conflict with Marcion who contested the reality of the body. There are times when it seems Menno is almost at one with Tertullian as in the following reference of Tertullian to the body of Christ:

> As, then, the first Adam is thus introduced to us, it is a just inference that the second Adam likewise, as the apostle has told us, was formed by God into a quickening spirit out of the ground —in other words, out of the flesh which was unstained as yet by any human generation.[14]

This passage isolated would seem to tell us that Tertullian thought God formed the flesh of Jesus. But later on the same page he throws us off the track again by saying:

> For as much, then, as the dispensation of God's purpose concerning His Son required that He should be born of a virgin, why should He not have received of the virgin the body which He bore from her?

We might also find a considerable identity between Menno's and Tertullian's views in the following which Tertullian wrote against Valentinus' idea that Christ's flesh was of a psychical or spiritual nature:

> Not without reason did He descend into the womb. Therefore He received (flesh) therefrom, else, if He received nothing therefrom, His descent would have been without a reason, especially if He meant to become flesh of that sort which was not derived from a womb, that is to say, a spiritual one . . . . He could have become spiritual flesh without such a process.[15]

Menno was thoroughly clear in his statement that Christ's flesh was not spiritual. He would go all the way with Tertullian except on the specific point of an absolute identity of the flesh of Jesus with that of Mary. Tertullian seems to have held to this identity while Menno fears such a concession would come too close to the inherently "sinful seed of Adam." The agreement between these two continues again in the discussion of the natures of Christ. Tertullian says:

> If the Word became flesh by transfiguration and change of substance, it follows at once that Jesus must be a substance compounded of two substances . . . and a third substance produced . . . . But we see plainly that the twofold state is not confounded but conjoined in one person—Jesus, God and man . . . . The property of each nature is so wholly preserved that the spirit [Christ's divine nature] on the one hand did all things in Jesus suitable to itself, such as miracles, mighty deeds, and wonders; and the flesh on the other hand exhibited the affections which belong to it—hunger, thirst, sorrow, and death. If, however, [the man Jesus was] some composite essence formed out of the two substances . . . there would be no proof apparent of either nature. But by a transfer of functions, the spirit would have done things to be done by the flesh, and the flesh such as are effected by the spirit, (or else things) confusedly of some third character.[16]

We must not magnify the agreement of these two to the extent that it be understood that Menno's theory of the incarnation was derived from Tertullian. There are many similarities, but there are also similarities in thought between Menno and the Roman Catholics, yet we would not say that these similarities are necessarily derived from them. The agreement with Tertullian is

also nullified on the question of inherent sin. Menno often maintained that if Christ's flesh was identical in substance with Mary's it would be sinful. This may have been in opposition to the theory of the immaculate conception, as held by the Roman church, though Menno never says so. Tertullian opposes Menno's idea on this point as follows:

> You say, if He took our flesh, Christ's was a sinful flesh . . . . [But] in putting on our flesh He made it His own; in making it his own he made it sinless. A word of caution must be addressed to all who refuse to believe that our flesh was in Christ on the ground that it came not of the seed of a human Father; let them remember that Adam himself received this flesh of ours without the seed of a human father. As earth was converted into this flesh of ours without the seed of a human father, so also was it quite possible for the Son of God to take[17] to Himself the substance of the selfsame flesh, without a human father's agency.[18]

In the case of Origen (185-254) we do not find such a full discussion of the incarnation. In what little he does write we find Menno's agreement with him is similar to that of Tertullian. Menno, however, calls attention to the fact that Luther considers Origen "the falsest explainer of the Scriptures."[19] But this cannot have referred to the incarnation, for Origen says:

> The Son of God, then, designed for the salvation of the human race to appear unto men, and to sojourn among them, assumed not only a human body, as some suppose, but also a soul resembling our souls indeed in nature but in will and power resembling Himself.[20]

The foregoing seems rather vague, but Menno's agreement with him is further confirmed when Origen writes that:

> Christ became a man, and was incarnate although God, and while made a man remained the God which He was; that He assumed a body like to our own, differing in this respect only, that it was born of a virgin and of the Holy Spirit: that this Jesus Christ was truly born, and did truly suffer, and did not endure this death common (to man) in appearance only, but did truly die.[21]

Now while we have here a fairly close parallelism as to the natures of Christ in the incarnation, we cannot be at all certain that any of the elements peculiar to Menno's view of the process of incarnation were held by Origen. In fact, the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that they were not.

Cyprian (200-258) gives us nothing on which to base any

comparison. Gregory Thaumaturgus (205-265) also does not write anything of value on the incarnation. Alexander of Alexandria (237-326) writes considerably on the deity of Christ as opposed to the ideas of Arius, but, like the others has practically nothing to say of the incarnation. But in the case of Lactantius (260-330) a number of expressions appear that have some semblance to Menno's view in general. Menno was strong on the personality element and the mysterious connected with the incarnation. So was Lactantius when he said:

> If it is known to all that certain animals are accustomed to conceive by the wind and the breeze, why should anyone think it wonderful when we say that a virgin was made fruitful by the Spirit of God?[22]

As to the method of bringing light and guidance to man, the two seem to hold practically the same viewpoint. Menno's idea has been previously discussed, and Lactantius says:

> When God had determined to send to man a teacher of righteousness, He commanded Him to be born again the second time in the flesh, and to be made in the likeness of man himself, to whom He was about to be a guide, companion, and teacher.[22]

A still closer resemblance appears in Lactantius' reference to Christ being a middle substance between God and Man. Menno, as was said, seems to have held that Christ's flesh was not like other men as to sin and also as to composition; Menno having thought that divine seed and human nourishment of the same would not produce the same flesh as that of a human male origin nourished by a human mother. Note Lactantius' rather vague reference on this point:

> In His first nativity which was spiritual, He was motherless, because He was begotten by God the Father alone, without the office of a mother. But in His second which was in the flesh, He was born of a virgin's womb without the office of a father, that bearing a middle substance between God and man, He might be able, as it were, to take by the hand this frail and weak nature of ours, and raise it to immortality.[23]

Again it should be remarked that this semblance does not prove origin. It would be interesting beyond measure if it were possible to prove an absolute identity of view with some of the many ancients referred to by Menno and with whom he seems to have been fairly familiar. But the Ante-Nicene field has proved itself fruitless of such. We turn therefore to the Nicene and Post-Nicene era.

Athanasius (298-373) is always remembered by the part he played in the Nicene Council which defined the deity of Christ in 325 A. D. His teaching on the incarnation was doubtless acceptable to Menno in many respects. He taught that the incarnation meant flesh as the flesh of man which Christ took upon Himself for our sakes:

> Therefore let those deny that the Son is from the Father by nature and proper to His essence, deny also that He took true human flesh of Mary Ever Virgin; for in neither case had it been of profit to us men, whether the Word were not true and naturally Son of God, or the flesh not true which He assumed . . . being created man for our sake, and having made for us that new way, as has been said.[24]

Nor would Menno hesitate to accept Athanasius' view of the relation of Jesus to Mary. It has been pointed out that Menno considered Mary a true mother to Jesus, but denied the identity in nature of His flesh with hers. Athanasius says:

> Let us then consider Christ in both ways, the divine Word made one in Mary with Him which is from Mary. For in her womb the Word fashioned for Himself His house, as at the beginning He formed Adam from the earth.[25]

The agreement of these two is complete except on the substance of the flesh as the foregoing quotations would show. The following quotation would also show this, but would also show the agreement on the question of Christ's mission as having a definite relation to man's need:

> Unable to bear that death should have the mastery . . . He takes unto Himself a body, and that of no different sort from ours.[26]

In Hilary of Poitiers (300-367) one finds slightly more of a philosophical or perhaps spiritual emphasis than in Athanasius. Menno would probably follow with joy after a statement of Christ's integrity such as we find in Hilary's following words:

> Though the form of our body was in the Lord yet He by virtue of His origin was not in the body of our weakness and imperfection . . . . [His] body was truly and indeed body, because it was born of the virgin. But it was above the weakness of our body, because it had its beginning in a spiritual conception.[27]

But what would Menno say about the following statement of Mary's contribution to the body of Jesus? He would agree as to the teaching on deity found in this passage, but the human substance teaching would probably be quietly laid aside:

> The virgin conceived from the Holy Ghost alone, and though for His birth in the flesh she supplied from herself that element, which women always contribute to the seed planted in them . . . . His mother performed the same part as in all human conceptions: but by virtue of His origin He never ceased to be God.[28]

Menno also referred to Cyrill (Tyrill) of Jerusalem (318-386) but not on the question of the incarnation. However, with the analysis of his view in mind it would be safe to say he would accept entirely Cyrill's utterance on the true humanity, but it is not likely that Cyrill made any contribution to Menno's view of the body of Christ:

> This only begotten Son of God . . . took upon Him this human nature of like passions with us . . . and was made man, not in seeming and mere show[29] but in truth; nor yet by passing through the virgin as through a channel[30]; but was of her made truly flesh.[31]

In Gregory of Nazianzen (325-391) we come upon a statement that sounds almost like Menno's words against Martin Micron in the year 1554[32]:

> What He was He laid aside; what He was not He assumed; not that He became two, but He deigned to be one made out of two. Both are God, that which assumed, and that which was assumed; two natures meeting in one, not two sons (let us not give a false account of the blending.)[33]

There is nothing in this that Menno might object to, nor is there in it any suggestion that Menno might have received help in formulating his theory of the process of becoming flesh. The same is true of Ruffinius (344-408) and St. Jerome (345-420). Neither of these make any significant mention of the incarnation.

Chrysostum (347-407) is also mentioned by Menno Simons. He has much to say of the mystery of the incarnation, as Menno also did in his own time. Chrysostum says:

> How did He take not all the flesh from the womb, but a part thereof, and increased it and fashioned it? Paul, by saying, "made of Woman," stops the mouths of those who say Christ came among us as through a conduit . . . . If this were so He hath nothing in common with us, but that flesh is of some other kind and not of the mass which belongs to us . . . . Therefore, that He was of us, and of our substance, and of the virgin's womb, is manifest from these things, and from others besides; but how, is not manifest. Do not thou then inquire; but receive what is revealed, and be not curious about what is kept secret.[34]

The foregoing has in it a note that is not in the least foreign to Menno when he objects to those who desire to probe the mystery of the incarnation too deeply. He says, "The Scriptures testify with invincible power to the ineffable divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," and, as to the incarnation, he says, he "has no doubt in the least that a pious, humble, God-fearing conscience will herewith be satisfied, and will not search into the incomprehensible mystery."[35]

In another connection Chrysostum says:

> If anyone assert the unity of the Godhead, Sabellius straightway turns that expression to his own advantage in confounding the persons. If he distinguish the persons, and say that the Father is one, and the Son another, and the Holy Spirit, up gets Arius, ready to wrest that distinction of persons into a difference of substance. We must avoid both . . . by confessing that the Godhead of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is all one, while we add thereto a trinity of persons.[36]

It will be seen that this is not in the least unlike Menno's statement of the Trinity in which he said: "These three . . . the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit . . . are one incomprehensible . . . eternal, and sovereign God."[37] But when we return to the limits set for the incarnation Chrysostum contributes nothing to Menno's view.

There are good reasons for supposing that Menno agreed with Augustine in saying that the incarnation was designed for the salvation of man:

> He by whom we were to be created was born of God, and He by whom we were to be re-created was born of a woman . . . . The Word Himself first chose to be born of man, that thou mightest be born of God unto salvation.[38]

Nor would the agreement between Augustine and Menno be any less noticeable in teaching of the union of the two natures. Augustine says:

> [The Son of David emptied Himself] by taking that which He was not, not by losing that which He was . . . . He was made that which He made, that what He made might not perish, very man, very God, God and man whole Christ.[39]

But when one returns to the process of becoming flesh, and the substance of the same, he finds the same difference in Augustine as has been found in so many of the fathers mentioned by Menno. Augustine says on this point:

> He took upon Him earth from earth; because flesh is from the earth, and He received flesh from the flesh of Mary.[40]

It is no doubt true that Menno Simons was an ardent reader after the early church fathers, but their writings yield no encouragement to the belief that he was influenced by any one of them in the formation of his view, namely, that Jesus was really man but that the substance of His flesh was unlike that of Mary. But on such phases of the incarnation as the deity, the two natures, the purpose, the cause, and the meaning, he probably found much that was of use to him.

C. *Contacts with Medieval Views of the Incarnation*

Menno testifies to the fact that Luther influenced him at the time he served as a priest at Pingjum, Friesland. Menno was then in doubt concerning the real presence of the body of Christ in the communion bread. At the same time he says, "I was encouraged by the writings of Luther that breaking the commandments of men cannot be the cause of eternal death."[41] We see by this that Luther aided Menno in shaking off the fear of the church and her authority.

On the doctrinal point of the two natures of Christ in the incarnation, Menno quotes Luther in his debate with Martin Micron, the Zwinglian. Micron was contending for the separation of the two natures and the fact that only the human Christ suffered in the crucifixion. To this Menno replies as follows:

> Two persons in Christ, namely, the one the second person in the Godhead, and the other the man of Mary's flesh, in which human person the divine person dwelt. This error is not only controverted by us, but also by Luther, when he says: "Beware, beware (I say) of the Alleosi; it is the devil's mask; for it will ultimately establish such a Christ as I would not be called after, namely, that Christ henceforth is no more, and that His suffering avails no more than the suffering of a common saint. For, if I should believe that alone human feeling suffered for me, then that Christ would be a poor Savior. He would stand in need of a Savior Himself . . . . We [Luther] say, God is man and man is God."[42]

From the foregoing it is evident that Menno was well versed in the writings and thought of Luther. The agreement of the two on the incarnation is very striking in some respects. For Luther's viewpoint notice three references on the point in question:

> He became man, was conceived and born without sin by the Holy Ghost and the virgin, that He might become Lord over all sin.[43]
>
> By "flesh" we understand the whole man, body and soul . . . that is, a man like every other man, who has flesh and blood, body and soul.[44]

> Also, they teach that the Word, that is, the Son of God, took unto Him man's nature, in the womb of the blessed virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, the divine and the human, inseparately joined together in unity of person; one Christ, true God and true man.[45]

Menno held practically the same on the point of the two natures:

> The incarnate Word . . . is truly God and man, man and God; God at all times, of God and in God; God's eternal Word, who in due time, according to the patriarchs, became a miserable, suffering, mortal man in Mary, the pure virgin who was of the seed of Abraham.[46]

However, care must be exercised that we do not unduly magnify the influence of Luther over Menno. The focal point of this study is the incarnation, and it is at this point that we find a distinction between Luther and Menno. Luther said, "a man like every other man who has flesh and blood." Menno said, "He is not of Mary's flesh."[47] The difference is this, that Luther considers Jesus' flesh identical in substance with that of man; Menno considers it as different from that of man because he would shield Jesus from inheriting the sin of Adam. But, the very fact that Menno does not call attention to this difference between his view and that of Luther goes to show that he did not consider the difference sufficient to undertake a controversy. It shows rather that he endeavored to combat the Zwinglian theory of the separated natures.

The Pietists may be mentioned in this connection because of their Lutheran theology. Philip Spener (1635-1705) and August Francke (1663-1727) are the two leaders of Pietistic thought. Their work is a century later than that of Menno, therefore, the only question that might arise is whether Menno's view of the incarnation influenced their theology. They emphasized piety as Menno did, but in theology they were thoroughly Lutheran. Carl Mirbt says:

> Spener's importance was not inherent in his theology. He meant to be simply an orthodox Lutheran, and persistently dwelt on his harmony with the doctrinal standards of the Lutheran church, but he shifted the center of interest from the maintenance of orthodox doctrine to conduct and practical piety.[48]

With this testimony agrees that of E. S. Waterhouse who wrote on the question of Spener's theology. He says that:

> Except for his insistence on the need for regeneration before a

> man should teach theology . . . there was little to distinguish Spener's views from the orthodox Lutheran creed of his day.[49]

The connection between Huldreich Zwingli and Menno Simons is not so significant as that between Menno and Luther. Jackson, a close student and translator of Zwingli, says:

> Zwingli remained rather upon the ground of the simple doctrine of Chalcedon: that there are two natures, human and divine, each perfect and entire, that they are not confounded, and that each remains what it is according to its own character. [To explain the relationship of the natures he used the term] Alloiosis, of transference. This takes place when "one names one of the two natures and understands the other; or names that which they both are and understands nevertheless only one of the two."[50]

Menno attacked this theory saying, "If the Alleosi stands, as Zwingli teaches it, Christ must be two persons, one divine, the other human."[51] It is also worthy of note that Köstlin, in his *Theology of Luther,* interprets Luther's thought of Zwingli's view almost exactly as did Menno Simons:

> Thus, as Luther describes the theory, the Scriptures are supposed simply to take the one nature for the other, whilst each of the natures, in reality, yet remains so distinct from the other as to retain only its own characteristic modes of activity . . . . When the Scriptures speak of the suffering of Christ, this is according to Zwingli, to be understood only of His human nature. But in this case, Christ accomplishes nothing more by His sufferings than any other mere saint. If only the human nature suffered for us, then is Christ a poor Savior and stands in need, indeed, of a Savior Himself.[52]

Practically all of Menno's significant debates were held with Zwinglians or those with Zwinglian views of Christ. This concept of the Alloiosis as an explanation for the relationship of the two natures seems to have furnished the point of difference that led to the disputations. Menno insisted emphatically that the two natures are present and form a personal unity, and when the human suffered the divine also suffered.

There do not seem to have been any direct contacts made between John Calvin and Menno. The two would agree on the deity, the two natures, but on the substance of the flesh we find the same difference as existed between Luther and Menno. Calvin said:

> That He was formed in the womb of the virgin, of her substance, to be the true seed of David, as had been foretold by the proph-

> ets, and that this was effected by the miraculous and secret agency of the Spirit without human connection.[53]

Menno would agree with every point of the foregoing, except the phrase, "of her substance." Instead, he would say:

> As Mary was of the sinful seed of Adam, as we are, she therefore, was concluded under sin the same as we are, for the Scriptures except none of Adam's seed . . . whereby it is plainly shown that He is not of Mary's flesh, but that the Father's most glorious Word which knew no sin became flesh.[54]

Erasmus and some of his writings were also known to Menno. In commenting on Hebrews 2:7, "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels," Menno attempted to prove that the incarnation of Jesus meant a condescension for God and not for man. In this connection he reveals the fact that he was a student of the work of Erasmus, although one could not prove that Erasmus assisted Menno to his view, but rather that Menno uses Erasmus to prove his own point. He says:

> Here I would admonish the reader to observe that both Erasmus and Hieronymus, in their Latin translations, have translated this thus: "Thou madest Him a little lower than the angels;" and the Hebrew Psalm also has it: "Thou madest Him inferior to God." . . . . This agrees with Paul in Philippians 2:7, "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant."[55]

Menno also quotes Erasmus as saying concerning the deity of Christ, that, "The Word was God. It was almighty, out of the almighty, with the Father, not brought forth for that time, but for all time."[56] He does not use this for any purpose except to point out the thought of the time on the subject of the deity. There seems to be no evidence for believing that Erasmus played any part in the formation of Menno's view of the flesh of Christ, but the two did agree on the deity.

It is known that anti-Trinitarian thought existed in the Netherlands, and elsewhere, during Menno's time. It was represented by such men as Hans Denk and Ludwig Hetzer; but this thought was not definitely worked out until the time of Faustus Socinus, (1539-1604). This is later than Menno Simons, but there is a sense in which Socinus became the spokesman of anti-Trinitarian views which long existed, the same as Simons became the spokesman for Anabaptist views which existed earlier than his time.

O. Zöckler[57] says, "In common with the Anabaptists they ob-

jected to the holding of political office, resorting to civil courts, and taking part in military service." In this respect Menno would have agreed with the Socinians. Concerning the Trinity Socinus said: "Plurality of persons in one divine essence is impossible." Against the pre-existence of Christ, he said, "The beginning spoken of in John 1:1, refers to the beginning of the Gospel." The Holy Spirit was said to be, "not a person but a power or divine activity."[58] Of the incarnation Socinus said, "The Word became flesh," John 1:14, should be, "The Word was flesh." This latter change of John 1:14 would destroy Menno's theory of the incarnation; for Menno came back to this text again and again. It was a keystone in the arch of his theory.

D. *Menno's Own References to the Origins of His View*

Coming now to Menno's own references to the origins of his view we are limited to a very meagre quantity of information. Dosker is probably right in saying that "the Dutch Anabaptists held this idea [which Menno held] from the beginning." He says, Melchior Hoffman started the innovation (He considers him their founder), and that Menno at first preached Hoffman's view but later modified it.[59] In this latter statement Dosker seems to be mistaken if Menno's own statement that he never changed his viewpoint is true.

Mosheim might be the originator of Dosker's idea for he also thinks Menno modified his view. As to origins he says, Menno is commonly represented as the author of this doctrine concerning the origin of Christ's body, but that it appears to have existed before because many of the Münsterites held it, "who certainly received no instruction from Menno."[60] Alenson, in his *Tegenbericht*,[61] suggests that Menno was the originator because the martyrs before Menno knew nothing of these ideas of the incarnation. This seems nullified by the fact that some held it who were not taught by Menno.

S. Cramer[62] thinks Menno was unacquainted with the view at the time of his conversion. Now, if by this is meant that he was converted before he left the Catholic church it is probably an accurate conclusion because of the fact that in 1544 Menno himself says he did not know of it until the brethren suggested it to him:

> When this matter of the incarnation of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ was first set before me by the brethren, I was, on hearing it, greatly amazed and startled fearing that I should err in the matter and be found in hurtful unbelief.[63]

He also says that he was unsettled in mind concerning this matter even after his baptism. He was baptized by Obbe Philipps and joined the Obbenites[64] in January 1536. From this it would seem clear that "the brethren" who suggested the view were Obbenites and that Menno received his idea of the incarnation from them. This also appears to be the viewpoint of Horsch.[65] They seemingly endeavored to bring Menno to accept the view, which he did with misgiving, for he says:

> On account of this article I was after receiving baptism many a time so troubled and oppressed at heart . . . that I abstained from food and drink, beseeching and praying God . . . that He would rightly disclose and open to me . . . the mystery of the incarnation of His blessed Son.[63]

The foregoing was written to John a'Lasco in 1544. Menno seems to have consulted some of the Zwinglian friends of a'Lasco to see if they could help him out of his theological dilemma. He continues in his confession to a'Lasco by saying:

> I have, concerning the said matter which bore so heavily upon my conscience, discussed and treated with a few who are of your opinion or belief, yet no one could instruct or teach me sufficiently concerning this matter . . . . So at last, after much fasting, praying, heaviness and anxiety, I, through the grace of the Lord, was fully consoled and refreshed at heart, assured by the unerring, infallible testimony of the Scriptures, and I sincerely acknowledged and believed that Christ Jesus forever blessed, is the Lord from heaven.[63]

Let attention now be called to a very significant point pertaining to the view of Menno. Mosheim hinted at it but seems to have placed it in its wrong setting. It is the question as to whether or not Menno modified his view. Mosheim thinks Menno at first preached and then modified Melchior Hoffman's view that Christ's body came down from heaven. However, it seems more nearly correct to say that Menno modified the Obbenite[66] view before he accepted it fully. Of course it is true, he had affiliated himself with the Obbenites, but the great struggle through which he seems to have passed came right after this affiliation, indicating that Menno was unsatisfied with the view.

He seems to have consulted the Zwinglians, also the Scriptures, and finally to have come to his own settled viewpoint. This was the same course that he pursued earlier on the question of infant baptism.[67] He hesitated to join the Obbenites because of their view of the person of Christ, but he found so much else in common

with them that he took the step in spite of the point on the incarnation. He, however, seems then to have set to work immediately to battle his way through this problem. The result was, not the old Hoffman, neither the Obbenite, but the Menno Simons doctrine of the incarnation, which was more or less fully treated in the earlier discussion. Confirmation of this interpretation seems to be found in Menno's own confession that he never changed his position after having made up his mind:

> The merciful Lord, has by His grace and power, for about twenty one years, kept me steady in one sense concerning this foundation of the doctrine, notwithstanding the artifices devised against me by so many crafty spirits. All must testify to this if they have impartially read my books and heard my admonitions.[68]

This was written in 1556 and twenty one years earlier would give the year 1536, just the time when he was contemplating his exit from the Roman church, and also the time when the Anabaptist brethren were entreating him to become their leader. We would then say that Simons received his start on this view from the Obbenites who held much the same view as Hoffman did. He then constructed his own theory which was different from either of the others, and as we shall see had in it all the essential characteristics necessary to an evangelical view. It was not merely the "harmless error of an untrained mind," nor a "scholastic distinction," but a view thoroughly grounded in a concept of the nature of man that demanded real deity becoming real man. The fact that the view could be substantiated by the use of the Scriptures made it all the more significant to this earnest man.

We should, however, say another word about the contradictions earlier discussed. Alenson, followed by Vos, Dosker, and others claimed Menno contradicted himself in discussing his view. We saw these charges were almost totally unfounded. But we should remember that Menno did have great difficulty in making clear his idea of the incarnation. It seems that this was due to the fact that he himself had arrived at the so-called orthodox view of the body of Christ as far as the practical applications of the incarnation were concerned. Then, theoretically, he drew back from this view to save his former contention that the body of Jesus could not have been identical with Mary's because of the hereditary power of Adam's sin.

IV

A. *The Distinctive Character of Menno's View*

We have seen that Menno Simons' view of the incarnation has no similarity with Gnosticism except for the distant likeness to be found in the Gnostic teaching of the evil nature of all matter and Menno's view of the evil nature of all human flesh.

In the case of the church fathers the agreement is generally complete and there are evidences that he taught the same as they did with reference to the pre-existence of Christ, and His mission in the flesh. He did differ, however, on the process of becoming flesh and the substance of the flesh *per se*. The same general conclusion would hold in the case of the leading reformers.

That there are better theological statements than Menno's may be true, but that he did not appreciate the humanity of Christ, as some have intimated, is not in accord with the historical position which he held. It is safe to say that he had a most exalted conception of the person of Christ, not only as to deity, but also as to His humanity. Note his complete confession in the following paragraph:

> I have taught Jesus Christ and Him crucified, very God and very man, who, in an incomprehensible, inexpressible, and indescribable manner, was born of thee from all eternity, thy eternal Word and wisdom, thy eternal glory, and the express image of thy person, and that in the fulness of time, through the power of the Holy Spirit, He became, in the womb of the chaste virgin, Mary, real flesh and blood, a visible, tangible, and mortal man, like unto Adam and his posterity in all things, yet without sin; born of the seed or lineage of Abraham and David, dead and buried, arose again, ascended into heaven, and thus became before thee our only and eternal Advocate, Mediator, Intercessor, and Redeemer.[69]

It seems clear to the writer that Menno Simons' view of the person of Christ signifies historically an intention to say that Jesus Christ was the Son of God in a unique sense, that He had been begotten of the Father "from the beginning," that He came into this world voluntarily in order to carry out the purposes and designs of the Father, that He limited Himself in order to take this step, though the truly divine nature was also present, that He came as a man and lived as humans do, except that He remained sinless by an indefatigable cultivation of His God consciousness and an implicit obedience to all that pertained to the will of His Father, that He died an ignominious death by crucifixion, was buried, arose

from the dead, and returned again to heaven to the same position which He held before His limitation.

When Menno felt compelled to state or define the specific process of becoming flesh the troublous waters began to move. To his opponents it seemed as if contradictions appeared, and if one specialized in seeking contradictions there is no doubt that they could be found. But they are real only when an attempt is made to apply one statement of Menno to every aspect of his thought, or all statements to one aspect of his thought. Paradoxes appear in every conception of an incarnation, and they appeared in Menno's. There are three ways of arriving at a sinless Messiah in the flesh, (1) by making Mary sinless and His flesh as hers; this was the Roman way out; (2) by considering Mary sinful as all other descendants of Adam and making the flesh of Jesus of a different substance from hers; this was Menno's way out; (3) by considering the flesh of Jesus of the same substance as Mary's and teaching that sin is not in the flesh *per se* but is a matter of volition; this is the generally accepted Protestant view. Whether or not any of these views has in it contradictory elements, if we take in the entire context of Menno's thought his view stands in history as a satisfactory explanation (to many minds at least) of his conception of Christ's person. But the philosophical distinction made by him was so subtle that many of his followers were unable to express correctly his thought. The result was that, either they became confused or the idea was dropped by them, usually the latter.

B. *The View Logically Related to Menno's Ethical Principle*

Another fact that should be noted is that this new view is the logical outgrowth of Menno's ethical principle, namely, that Christianity demands correct ethics and that a Christian should conform his life to the principles of conduct exemplified by Jesus. In other words, Christianity meant a sinless life if its ideals were fully realized. This practical principle was grounded in the theoretical principle that all men have inherited sin from Adam which could only be annulled by the sacrifice of a sinless life. So when it came to the question of explaining the humanity of Jesus this basic idea at once came into play. In this man Jesus he believed was to be found the full expression of perfect humanity. Therefore, if sin is discovered in Him, either inherited or otherwise, at once the perfect man becomes imperfect and Menno's basal foundation is destroyed.

The significance of this is that throughout history Menno and his followers emphasized Christian living more than creed, or at

least equally as much as theological statements. The corruption of the Lutheran and the Roman state churches together with the intellectual subtleties and profligate lives of many of the learned were to him an invulnerable proof that Christianity must change a man's life if it is Christianity at all. If it does not do that, said Menno, then it is not Christianity. So he expressed himself when writing on baptism:

> If we only sought outward baptism and trusted in the literal practice, and would yet continue in our old, corrupted way, all would be in vain.[70]

Also when he wrote on the Twenty-fifth Psalm he said he planned to set forth an exposition, "not in great logic and rhetoric, but in a plain narration as dictated by his heart."[71] He said this would show the different dispositions of a true and a false Christianity. Whatever might be said of this method of placing piety before logic, it is a fact that Menno did not think that piety alone would suffice even though he thought it to be the *sine qua non* of Christianity. On the question of the relation of the incarnation to ethical life, he said:

> There are doubtless many among us who fear the Lord from their inmost souls and have never in their lives heard a syllable in regard to the mystery of this matter . . . . They have never inquired concerning it, nor do they know or understand it.[72]

By this we see that historically his emphasis was on life. If his followers gave evidence of reality of experience Menno was not the one to insist upon intellectual discernment of all intricate questions. However, one should not swing to the extreme viewpoint and say that he placed no value at all upon correct statements of creed. He did value definition and tried to formulate clearly his own views. He did not emphasize the ethical at the expense of the creedal, but simply taught that the ethical implications must accompany faith else the creedal is useless:

> In this case, neither emperor, king, doctor, licentiate, pope, nor Luther will avail. All who would be in the church of Christ, must be in Christ, must be of His mind, and walk as He walked.[73]

Menno's views of the incarnation therefore stands in history as the statement of one who had a high regard for the integrity of Christ's person. He sought perfection in humanity and claimed to have found it in Christ. He then constructed a view, with the aid of the Scriptures, that was to preserve in every detail the glory of the "blessed one." He believed in Him as the highest and noblest

expression of righteousness; and having believed, he tried to live as though it were really true. His confession of the incarnation is fairly complete, but Menno continually urged that a necessary evidence that one has a correct conception of Christ's person is if he lives righteously. It does not mean for a moment that he despised thought. It does mean that he believed that the most correct thinking about Christ could be done by those who had this vitalizing conception of the person of Christ. He says:

> Even if (one) could prove his doctrine and sacraments . . . to be in accordance with the Scriptures, then his cause would still be only half way correct; for the doctrine and sacraments are useless if the fruitful, active faith, and the pious, unblamable life are not there.[74]

There is no question that Menno's historical significance is his emphasis on a holy life. If it could be said that Luther reformed doctrine, and Calvin reformed worship, it could also be said that Menno reformed life. The Swiss[75] Mennonites seem also to have held to this principle of the absolute necessity of an upright life if one claims to be Christian. In this they were at one with Menno, but not so on the incarnation. They said, however, that their theory of the incarnation should not be pitted against that of the brethren of the low countries because the view held by the Dutch was not essential to harmonious relations with them. This action was taken at Strassburg in 1557 and while Menno himself is not mentioned, the reference is clearly to his view of the incarnation because he had by that time been teaching it in the Netherlands and elsewhere for approximately twenty years.

Even though Menno's view of the incarnation is not held by many Mennonites of to-day, the other principle of ethical conduct as a *sine qua non* by-product of Christianity can be found among most Mennonite groups. The majority of American Mennonites are of Swiss background but they cherish the same principles as did the Dutch in the time of Menno Simons. His incarnation theory, however, is not accepted by them, but the principle of right living is. And so, even if Menno's theory of Christ's humanity was a logical superstructure upon his basal ethical principle, it was not a necessary one as is shown by the fact that the Swiss arrived at the so-called orthodox view of the incarnation while holding to the same interpretation of Christian ethics as did Menno. This will then make it clear that the discussion is not intended to prove that Menno deduced his incarnation view from this ethical idea, but that

when he came to define the incarnation, the ethical principle had an unmistakable influence upon his theory.

Perhaps further clarity would result if we would say that Menno's view manifests the following points: (1) The sinfulness of man is inherited from Adam. (2) Man's sin is taken away by God who became man in Jesus of Nazareth. (3) In becoming man Jesus could not have the identical flesh as other men because He would then be sinful. (4) The object of Jesus in becoming flesh is sinlessness in man, therefore, He may not be sinful Himself. (5) Becoming man must then involve a new departure which was supplied by the Holy Spirit. (6) The man Jesus was truly man of the same type as Adam before the fall. (7) If man claims any vital relationship with Jesus it is necessary that he live the same kind of life as Jesus did. This latter is Menno's ethical principle which had such a considerable influence upon his view of the incarnation, but, as was said before, not a necessary one. The real basis of his idea that the flesh of Jesus was not of the same substance as man's, was the first of the aforementioned list, namely, that all those born by way of the regular human process of reproduction bring with them the sin of the first parent, Adam.

Historically, Menno Simons is the apostle of piety as Luther is of the justification by faith principle. It would be unfair to say that Luther demanded only faith regardless of works and that Menno demanded only works and ignored faith. But it is doubtless correct to say that faith is Luther's great point, while Menno's grand distinction is to be found in his teaching that faith must manifest itself in life else it cannot be called an active and living faith.

C. *The Effect of Menno's View*

The earliest confession of faith drawn up by the followers of Menno Simons was called, *A Brief Confession of the Principal Articles of the Christian Faith,* and was written by John de Rys and Lubbert Gerrits, Mennonite ministers of North Holland. The date is 1580. Menno's interpretation of the incarnation of Christ is embodied beyond all doubt in article VIII, which reads as follows:

> God . . . sent His eternal Word, or Son, from heaven, who in the body of the virgin Mary was made flesh or man through the admirable power of God and the incomprehensible operation of His Holy Spirit.[76]

Notice the phrase, "in the body [not of the body] of the virgin Mary." Then for the sake of clarity follow the words of Men-

no and notice the phrase, "in Mary [not of Mary] by the omnipotence of God:"

> Thus was also brought about the miraculous incarnation of Jesus Christ in Mary by the omnipotence of God by which He can do anything He pleases.[77]

An Englishman by the name of John Smith, who is credited as the founder of a sect of English Baptists in Amsterdam, Holland, was influenced by Rys and Gerrits, the authors of the Mennonite confession of 1580. Through their influence Smith became convinced of the Biblical teaching of believers' baptism. He later joined the Mennonites but not before a statement of doctrine had been drawn up which is almost identically the same as the Mennonite confession. Notice the article on the incarnation and the influence of Menno's view:

> God . . . hath sent out of heaven His everlasting Word, or Son . . . and hath caused Him to become flesh . . . in the womb of the holy virgin (called Mary) by His word and power, and the working of the Holy Ghost.[78]

However, after the influence of Smith ceased, the English Baptists, in 1611, drew up *A Declaration of Faith of English People Remaining at Amsterdam in Holland.* In this document Menno's view is replaced and the clause on the incarnation reads:

> Jesus Christ, the Sonne off God . . . was manifested in the flesh . . . the Sonne off Marie the Virgine, made of hir substance.[79]

That the view found its way into England is shown by the fact that there was at least one martyrdom caused by the belief that was taught by Menno Simons on the incarnation. So says Vedder:

> In 1550, Joan Boucher of Kent, was burned for heresy. She held . . . that though Jesus was born of Mary, He did not inherit her flesh; the idea being that, if He had, He must have shared her sinful human nature.[80]

Besides the foregoing there seem few traces of the view in England, but there are a few more in Holland. A statement drawn up at Amsterdam in 1630, called *Confession of Faith, and the Principal Articles of the Christian Doctrine,* gives evidence of a tendency to avoid controversy on this point of the incarnation, yet it seems in a general way to embody Menno's idea, but does not differentiate it from other views:

> And since there has been for many years, and still is daily, much disputation, concerning this birth of our Savior, accord-

> ing to the flesh; therefore we believe and confess, that it is a supernatural birth, which cannot be fathomed by human reason . . . . In the fulness of time, came forth from the Father [the Son] . . . was . . . conceived in the virgin body of Mary . . . by the power of the most high God, and the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, and became flesh, remaining what He had been, namely, God and the Son of God, and becoming what He had not been, namely, man and the son of man.[81]

The last actual doctrinal statement of the Dutch and other Mennonites is called the *Confession of Dort,* or, *The Eighteen Articles,* and was drawn up in 1632, at Dort, Holland. It reads, on the point of the incarnation:

> We believe that the Savior, proceeded from God, . . . came into the world, yea into the flesh, . . . was conceived in the virgin Mary, . . . and that she brought Him forth as her firstborn son . . .
>
> We believe also, that this is the same [who] . . . Himself is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last; that He is the same, and no other, . . . who was brought into the world, and to whom a body was prepared, which He yielded up as a sacrifice and offering; . . . but as to how and in what manner this precious body was prepared, and how the Word became flesh, and He Himself man, in regard to this we content ourselves with the statement pertaining to this matter which the worthy evangelists have left us . . . .[82]

The foregoing shows clearly the influence of Menno's view. It was afterward adopted by Mennonites of the Palatinate and Alsace, and has remained to this day, with minor exceptions, the standard confession of faith, not only in Europe, but also in America. Since these minor exceptions are not printed (though some minor additions are) it was necessary to rely upon the testimony of representative Mennonite leaders as to the interpretation of Menno's view of the incarnation as laid down by the Dutch in 1632. Bishops, ministers, and historians practically all agreed that Menno's view of the incarnation was acceptable as pertained to the preexistence of Christ, the deity, the virgin birth, the mission, the crucifixion in the flesh, and the resurrection; but, on the substance of the flesh they said, "He became flesh of Mary," while Menno said, "He became flesh in Mary, but not of Mary."

During this study the acquaintance of one American Mennonite leader was made, a member of the Mennonite General Conference, who holds to the view of Menno as regards the flesh of Jesus. There may be others but they are doubtless few in number, the Mennonites holding more or less generally to the view that Jesus

became flesh "of Mary" and not merely "in Mary." And yet, strange as it may seem, Menno's view is printed verbatim in what might be considered the standard Mennonite confession of faith, *The Confession of Faith and Minister's Manual.* Note the following paragraph:

> [The Son] was sent into the world, and himself delivered up the body prepared for Him, . . . but how, and in what manner, this worthy body was prepared, or how the Word became flesh, and He Himself man, we content ourselves with the declaration which the faithful evangelists have given and left in their description thereof; according to which we confess with all the saints, that He is the Son of the living God.[83]

NOTES

1 *Cycl. Bib. Theol. and Eccl. Lit.,* III, 892-894.
2 *Bib. Rev. Neerl.,* V, 380. Also Dosker, *The Dutch Anabaptists,* 166, note 5. In an indirect reference, Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* II, 344, says: "Melchior Hoffman and Menno Simonis . . . supposed, like the Valentinians in the first period, that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom."
3 Melchior Hoffman was an Anabaptist leader who preceded Menno. He taught that Christ's body came down from heaven.
4 *Tegenwoordige Staet der Doopsgezinden of Mennoniten,* 15.
5 *Cycl. Bib. Theol. and Eccl. Lit.,* X. 699 f.
6 *Opera,* 580a; *Works,* II, 313. For quotations on evil flesh see Chapter III, page 51.
7 The Psalmist, 51:5, "In sin did my mother conceive me." Paul, Romans 5:19, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." An ancient Chinese proverb says, "There are but two good men, one is dead, the other is not yet born." An Indian proverb says, "The only good Indian is a dead Indian." So also Plutarch, Seneca, Cicero, Shakespeare, Goethe, and many others. For full treatment see A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology,* II, 573-582.
8 *Opera,* 589b to 590a; *Works,* II, 392.
9 *Instit. Hist. Eccl.,* (English) III, 214.
10 *Cycl. Bib. Theol. and Eccl. Lit.,* V, 707.
11 *Ibid,* VII, 835-836.
12 *History of Dogma,* III, 336; VI, 8.
13 Many of these dates of the fathers are necessarily conjectural due to lack of data. The dates followed are those given in the American reprint of the Edinburgh edition of the *Fathers.*
14 *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* III, 536.
15 *Ibid,* III, 538.
16 *Ibid,* III, 623f. For Menno's view see Chapter III, Section B.
17 Transire in—to pass into.
18 *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* III, 536.
19 *Opera,* 428a; *Works,* II, 225.
20 *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* IV, 378.
21 *Ibid,* IV, 240.
28 *Ibid,* IX, 186. (Since making this study the writer has come upon some data in the writings of Hilary that would seem to reveal considerable more similarity than is here recognized, but this material must be left for a later study.)
23 *Ibid,* VII, 112.
24 *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* IV, 387.
25 *Ibid,* IV, 446.

[26] *Ibid,* IV, 40.
[27] *Ibid,* IX, 191.
[28] *Ibid,* IX, 186. (Since making this study the writer has come upon some data in the writings of Hilary that would seem to reveal considerable more similarity than is here recognized, but this material must be left for a later study.)
[29] Written against the Docetae who said Christ had only a psychical body.
[30] Written against the Valentinians who held the same as the Docetae concerning the body, and besides said, Christ simply passed through Mary without any vital contact.
[31] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* VII, 21.
[32] See Discussion of the two natures in Chapter III, Section B.
[33] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* VII, 338.
[34] *Ibid,* X, 22-23.
[35] *Opera,* 389b-391a; *Works,* II, 186-188.
[36] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* IX, 66.
[37] *Opera,* 390a; *Works,* II, 187.
[38] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* VII, 18.
[39] *Ibid,* VI, 401.
[40] *Ibid,* VIII, 485.
[41] Chapter I, note 4. Horsch, p. 19, has pointed out that Luther's books were in the hands of the priests at Witmarsum, to which place Menno was transferred from Pingjum. Horsch says, "The account of the general treasurer of the Frisian government shows that between October 1, 1527 and September 30, 1528 a certain sum was paid to an officer of the law who had 'opened the boxes belonging to the pastor and the vicar at Witmarsum and taken from them the books of Martinus Luther and others of his persuasion.'"
[42] *Opera,* 314a; *Works* II, 98. (Menno does not cite this reference in Luther's Works, and owing to the poorly indexed Weimar edition of Luther's *Werke* it has not been possible to verify the quotation. However, Köstlin, in his *Theology of Luther,* vol. II, p. 134, interprets Luther the same as Menno on this same point. See context of note 52 in this chapter of thesis).
[43] Luther's *Primary Works,* 100.
[44] *Precious and Sacred Writings of Martin Luther,* 215-216.
[45] *Augsburg Confession,* Article III; also *Book of Concord,* 38.
[46] *Opera,* 314b; *Works,* II, 99.
[47] *Ibid,* 568a; *Ibid,* II, 374. While Simons was willing to take advantage of agreement in his thought with that of others, he was also an independent thinker. He says he rejected Luther on infant baptism because it was not taught in the Scriptures: "Desiring to know the grounds for infant baptism, I consulted (the writings of) Luther. He taught that children were to be baptized on account of their own faith. I perceived that this was not in accordance with the Word of God." (*Opera,* "Uytgangh van het Pausdom," 2a). Later he says, "I am asked why, as an unlearned man, I am not content with the explanation of the doctors, particularly Luther, who says that faith lies dormant in little children . . . etc." (*Opera,* 404b; *Works,* II, 199.)
[48] Schaff-Herzog, *Cyclop. of Rel. Knowledge,* IX, 56.
[49] Hastings, *Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics,* X, 8.
[50] Jackson's *Huldreich Zwingli,* 396-397.
[51] *Opera,* 314a; *Works,* II, 98.
[52] *Theology of Luther,* II, 134.
[53] *Tracts of the Reformation,* I, 44.
[54] *Opera,* 568a; *Works,* II, 374.
[55] *Ibid,* 376a; *Ibid,* II, 169.
[56] *Ibid,* 364; *Ibid,* II, 154.
[57] Schaff-Herzog, *Encycl. of Rel. Knowledge,* X, 488. Same reference for all quotations in paragraph.
[58] For Menno's view of the Holy Spirit see Chapter III, note 55, also the context of note 55.
[59] *The Dutch Anabaptists,* 165, 167, 170.
[60] *Instit. Ecc. Hist.,* 704.
[61] *Bib. Ref. Neerl.,* VII, 179. (Cited by Dosker).

62 *Real Encyclopedia,* XII, 195. (Cited by Horsch).
63 *Opera,* 525a; *Works,* II, 330.
64 The Obbenites were peaceful Anabaptists who took their name from their leaders, Obbe and Dirk Philipps.
65 *Life, Labors, and Teachings,* 150.
66 The Obbenites may have obtained it from Hoffman.
67 See J. Newton Brown's very graphic presentation of Menno's method of making up his mind on doubtful questions: *Life and Times of Menno,* 17-20.
68 *Opera,* 562b; *Works,* II, 363.
69 *Ibid,* 174a; *Ibid,* I, 225.
70 *Ibid,* 406b; *Ibid,* II, 201.
71 *Ibid,* 163; *Ibid,* I, 214.
72 *Ibid,* 527; *Ibid,* II, 332.
73 *Ibid,* 306a; *Ibid,* II, 89.
74 *Ibid,* 356a; *Ibid,* II, 144.
75 Horsch, 201.
76 McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* 30.
77 *Opera,* 592a; *Works,* II, 395.
78 McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* 56.
79 *Ibid,* 88.
80 *Short Hist. Baptists,* 110. (1891 edition).
81 *Martyrs Mirror,* 33a.
82 *Ibid,* 37b-38a.
83 Pages 10-11. (Edition of 1900).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

A. *Dutch*:

Simons, Menno, *Opera Menno Symons,* ofte Groot Sommarie. Gedruckt in't Jaer ons Heeren, Anno 1646. (This is the first edition of Menno's works.)

Simons, Menno, *Opera Omnia Theologica of alle de Godtgeleerde Wercke van Menno Symons.* Folio Edition of 1681 by Hendrick Jansz Herrison. Amsterdam, Holland.

Simons, Menno, *Menno Simons Tractaten over den Deep, het Avondmaal, Enz* voorafgegan door Een Kort Levensbericht en M. S., Uit gang van het Pausdom. Jöhannes Müller. Amsterdam, 1892.

Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica, "Geschriften uit den Tijd der Hervorming in de Nederlanden." Tweede Deel, 1904. *Ibid,* "Nederlandsche Anabaptistica" (Geschriften van Henrick Rol, Melchior Hoffman, Adam Pastor, De Broederlicke vereenige); Vijfde Deel, 1909. *Ibid,* "De Geschriften van Dirk Philipz," Tiende Deel, 1914. All edited by S. Cramer and F. Pijper; Printed by Martinus Nijhoff, 'S-Gravenhage, Holland.

B. *German*:

Simons, Menno, *Die Vollständigen Werke Menno Simons, Ubersetzt aus der Originalsprache, dem Hollandischen.* Mennonitsche Verlags-Handlung, Elkhart, Indiana; vol. I, 1876; vol. II, 1881.

Luther, Martin, *Werke,* 8 band. Herman Böhlau, Weimar; 1889.

Luther, Martin, *Der Kleine Katechismus Luther's und der Heidelberger Katechismus, mit einem gemeinsamen Spruchbuch Zu beiden.* Druck und Verlag des verein evang. Waisenhauses, Hanau, 1855.

Zwingli, Huldreich, *Sämtliche Werke.* Herausgegeben von Emil Egli und Georg Finsler. C. A. Schwetschke und Sohm, Berlin. Vols. 1-4.

C. *English*:

Simons, Menno, *The Complete Works of Menno Simon.* Translated from the original Dutch or Holland by (under the direction of) John F. Funk and Brother, Publishers, Elkhart, Indiana, 1871.

van Braght, Thielem J., *Martyrs Mirror.* Translated from the Dutch to English by Joseph F. Sohm. Mennonite Publishing Company, Elkhart, Indiana, 1886.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, editors. American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition; 8 vols. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1908.

Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the Fathers of the Christian Church since 325. Edited by Philip Schaff; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907.

The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes. Edited by Philip Schaff; 3 vols. Harper and Brothers, New York and London; 1877, 1905.

Baptist Confessions of Faith. Edited by W. J. McGlothlin. American Baptist Publication Society, Chicago and Philadelphia, 1911.

Luther's Epistle Sermons; Advent and Christmas Sermons. Translated by J. N. Lenker; vol. I. The Luther Press, Minneapolis, 1908.

Luther's Primary Works together with his shorter and larger Catechisms. Translated into English by Henry Wace and C. A. Bucheim. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1896.

Calvin, John, *Tracts Relating to the Reformation,* with his life by Theodore Beza. 3 vols. Translated from the Latin by Henry Beveridge. Printed by the Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh, 1884.

Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli. Translated by McLouth, Preble, and Gilmore. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1901.

Confession of Faith and Minister's Manual. Edited and compiled by J. F. Funk and J. S. Coffman, containing the Confession of Faith adopted at Dortrecht in 1632, the shorter Catechism, Forms of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Marriage, etc. Elkhart, Indiana; 1890, 1900, 1914.

SECONDARY SOURCES

A. *Dutch:*

Vos, K., *Menno Simons,* (1496-1561), *Zijn Leven en Werken en Zijne Reformatorische Deenkbeelden.* E. J. Brill, Leiden; 1914.

Cramer, A. M., *Het Leven en de Verrigtingen van Menno Simons, voorafgegaan door eene inleidende varhandlung over den oor sprung en de opkomst der Doopsgezinden, voornamelijk in de Nederlanden.* Johannes Müller, Amsterdam, 1837.

Rues, Simeon Frederik, *Tegenwoordige Staet der Doopsgezinden of Mennoniten, in de vereenigde Nederlanden.* F. Houttuyn, Amsterdam; 1745.

Kühler, W. J., *Het Socinianisme in Nederland.* A. W. Sijthoff, Leiden; 1912.

B. *Latin:*

Mosheim, Jo. Laur., *Institutionum Historiae Ecclesiasticae, Antiquae et Recentioris.* Libri quatuor. Apud Christianum Fridericum Wegand, Helmstadii, MDCCLXIV.

C. *German:*

Real-Encyklopaedie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Herausgeben von Herzog, Plitt, und Hauck; J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung. Leipzig, 1881, vol. IX. Articles on Menno Simons and Mennonites by de Hoop Scheffer.

Real-Encyklopaedie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Begründert von J. J. Herzog. Herausgegeben von Albert Hauck. J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1903. Vol. XII. Articles on Menno Simons and the Mennonites by S. Cramer.

D. *English*:

Horsch, John, *Menno Simons, His Life, Labors, and Teachings.* Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, 1916.

Brown, J. Newton, *The Life and Times of Menno, the celebrated Dutch Reformer.* American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1853.

Langenwalter, J. H., *Christ's Headship of the Church, according to Anabaptist Leaders whose Followers became Mennonites.* Mennonite Book Concern, Berne, Indiana, 1922.

Mosheim, John Lawrence, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History,* Ancient and Modern. In four books, translated by James Murdock, 3 vols. Robert Carter and Brothers, New York, 1871.

Köstlin, Julius, *The Theology of Luther in its Historical and inner Harmony.* Translated from the second German edition by Charles E. Hay. 2 vols. Lutheran Publication Society.

The Book of Concord, or the symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Translated from the original languages by G. W. Frederick, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1882.

Cyclopaedie of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, Vols. III, X. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1873. Especially article on Gnosticism.

Encyclopaedie of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, vol. X. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1919. Article by E. S. Waterhouse on Pietism.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, vols. VII, IX, X. Funk Wagnalls Company, New York and London, 1911. Articles on Pietism, Menno Simons, and Mennonites.

Allen, Alexander, *The Continuity of Christian Thought: A study of Modern Theology in the Light of its History.* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1884, 1912.

Mansel, Henry L., *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries.* John Murray, Albemarle Street, London; 1875.

Vedder, Henry C., *A Short History of the Baptists.* The American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, Chicago, etc., 1891, 1907, 1910.

Jackson, Samuel Macauley, *Huldreich Zwingli, The Reformer of German Switzerland* (1484-1531). G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, and London, 1900.

MISCELLANEOUS REFERENCES

A. *English*:

Harnack, Adolph, *History of Dogma,* seven vols. Translated from the third German edition by Neal Buchanan. Little, Brown, and Company, Boston, 1899.

Strong, A. H., *Systematic Theology,* 3 vols. The Griffith and Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1907.

Hyma, Albert, *The Christian Renaissance; a history of the "Devotio Moderna."* The Century Company, New York and London, 1924, 1925.

Mullins, Edgar Young, *The Christian Religion in its Doctrinal Expression.* Roger Williams Press, New York, Chicago, 1917. (Section on the Holy Spirit and the Trinity.)

Garvie, Alfred Ernest, *A Handbook of Christian Apologetics.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1923. (Section on the Trinity.)

A'Kempis, Thomas, *Of the Imitation of Christ.* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York.

Hagenbach, K. R., *A Text Book of the History of Doctrines,* Vol. II. Sheldon and Company, 335 Broadway, New York; 1862.

A HYMN OF THE SWISS BRETHREN

Christian Neff

Brother Samuel Geiser of Orange near Tavannes in Switzerland sent me the hymn printed below. He discovered it in an old collection of Anabaptist hymns. The collection contains some ninety-eight hymns which have been gathered into several "booklets." The first bears the heading: *Das neu auffgerichte Geistliche Liederbüchlein. Gedruckt im Jahr Christi* 1696 (The newly compiled spiritual hymn-booklet. Printed in the year of Christ 1696). The second: *Ein schönes newes Geistliches Liederbüchlein. Gedruct in diesem Jahr.* (A beautiful new spiritual hymn-booklet. Printed in this year). The Zurich-hymn which follows is contained in the fourth booklet. It is assumed that this was also printed in the year 1696 since the above statement regarding the time of printing is also annexed to the title page of this fourth booklet. At the close is added: *Gedruckt im Jahr, da wahre Buss vonnöthen war* (Printed in the year when genuine penitence was necessary). Unfortunately the place of printing is seldom indicated. Only in connection with one hymn is it stated: *Gedruckt zu Basel im Jahre* 1708 (Printed in Basel in the year 1708). Seldom also is the author indicated. Hans Rycher, of whom nothing else is known is an exception to this since he places his name after the Zurich-Hymn, of which he is the author. This hymn is all the more significant in that it was printed only a few decades after the Zürich occurrences. Since Rycher calls himself an old man in the last stanza it is not unlikely that he was a contemporary of the Anabaptist persecutions in Zurich. It would seem justifiable, in as much as they are not generally known, to give publicity to the hymns, such as the Hassilbacher, the Dürsrüttli, the Thessalonicher and possibly a number of other hymns.

Das Zürich-Lied

O Mensch wach auff in dieser Zeit
wol hier auff dieser Erden
wann nun die letste Rechnung seig
dass dir der Groschen werde.

2

Dass dir die Sonnen nicht undergang
ehe dass dein Feind mögest vertilgen
und tödten allesamt
und dein Leben verneuweren.

3

Es ist ein Herr im Himmelreich
der thut uns lieblich rufen
und spricht wir söllend zu ihm kohn
mit häller Stimm so süsse.

4

Er spricht, kommt alle här zu mir
die ihr hier sind beladen
und thund auch frölich trauwen mir
so heil ich euwern Schaden.

5

Wer nun zu diesem Herren komt
der ist gar wol entrunnen
wird leuchten wie die Sternen rein
auch wie die hälle Sonnen.

6

Wilt du zu diesem Herren kon
so musst dich sauber zieren
mit einem hällen neuwen Kleid
und alle Sünd verlieren.

7

Diss Kleid ist die newe Geburt
wie uns Johannes lehret
die nicht härkomt vom Fleisch und Blut
sondern von Gott dem Herren.

8

Wann du das Kleid anzogen hast
so wirst du bald vernemmen
des Teuffels Dück und kluge List
damit er dich will fahen.

9

Es ist ein ungeheurer Track*
er brület wie ein Löwe
dass er dich bring in seinen Sack
und thut dir hefftig tröwen.

10

Der Track der schiesst aus seinem Mund
ein grausam Gewitter

*Drache

Erhalt uns Herr zu aller Stund
der Streit wär sonst gar bitter.

11

Ein Wasserstrom, der also gross
die Frommen zu ertränken
Herr wach ob uns zu aller Stund
dass wir nicht thüend wancken.

12

Die Meers-Wällen die lauffen an
und thun so grausam wüten
Herr Gott wir wend dir dancken drumb
du thust uns wohl behüten.

13

Wer jetzt dein Wort hat gnommen an
dasselbig thut behalten
die wähend dieses Wetter an
und wil sie von dir spalten.

14

Der Endchrist lasst sich mit schärpffe auff
über die so Gott förchten
Herr Gott du wöllest sehen drauff
und deine Glieder stärken.

15

Dass wir nicht fallen in den Strick
wann nun die Zeit wird kommen
dass man uns dann verfolgen wird
dass wir nicht liegen unden.

16

Das Ungewitter ist so gross
Herr Gott dir thun ichs klagen
mit Rauben Gefängnuss ohne mass
hat manchen kost sein Leben.

17

Es ist ein Statt im Schweitzerland
da ist solches ergangen
mit ihrem Nahmen Zürich genandt
sie hand die Frommen gfangen.

18

Hand ihnen geraubet Gut and Hab
hands mit Wollust verschlemmet
es möcht wol jemand grausen drab
dass sie sich Christen nennen.

19
In einem alten Nunnen-Hauss
Oedenbach ist sein Nahmen
ist ihnen fürkommen manchen Strauss
und sind gar lang gefangen.

20
Biss sie der Herr von dannen führt
wie man es hat erfahren
die Trübsal währt ein lange Zeit
wol bey den zwäntzig Jahren.

21
Dass ihrer viel in dieser Zeit
an ihren Leib verdorben
wol von des Tracken Hass und Neid
sind etlich Hunger gestorben.

22
Der Felix Landis gar wol bekannt
und auch der Rudolff Sommer
die hand in dieser Gefängnuss
glitten ein sölchen Hunger.

23
Hand ihnen wol ein Wuchen lang
nichts gän dann lauter Wasser
dass sie hat dunckt sie müssen schier
ab ihren Händen essen.

24
Da sind sie beyd so schwach gesien
dass sie das Lutter Wasser
schier nicht mehr können zu ihm nän
in diesen Zwang so grosse

25
Noch haben sie gar frey bekannt
so wir der Höllen entrinnen
allhier in solcher Trübsal so gross
ist ihnen gar wol ergangen.

26
Also sind sie der leiblichen Speiss
nicht mehr theilhafftig worden
und da man ihnen bereitet hat
sind sie bald Hungers gstorben.

27
Auch beid im Frieden gescheiden hin
Gott sollen wir drumb dancken
dass er sie hat erhalten fein
dass sie nicht thäten wancken.

28

Sie haben frey mit ihrem Blut
die Wahrheit thun bekennen
wann Christus wieder kommen thut
so werden sie sich frewen.

29

Zuletzt wölten sie ihnen zessen gähn
da sind sie bald gestorben
wir hoffen sie haben in Himmelreich
viel Speiss und Tranck erworben.

30

Da sie ihnen nach hand zessen bracht
das kann ich nicht verschweigen
dass sie sie haben Hungers tödt
das wollen sie nicht leiden.

31

O blinde Welt wie bist du doll
wilt du noch Gott vexieren
die du bist Freud und Wollust voll
du wirst es bald verlieren.

32

Was meinst was wird am jüngsten Tag
dem für ein Antwort werden
der seinen Nächsten brauchen thut
und lasst ihn Hungers sterben.

33

Wann du dich nicht bekehren wirst
von deinem grausam Wüten
ich förchten du werdist am jüngsten Tag
verlieren Gottes Güte.

34

In dieser obgemeldten Statt
hand umb der Wahrheit willen
im Spithal und im Oedenbach
viel ihren Tagwerck erfüllet.

35

Sie giengen auff der Propheten Weg
da Christus auch ist gangen
sie haben verlassen Haab und Gut
und sind gar lang gefangen.

36

Das ihren viel gestorben sind
in diesem Ungewitter
O Herre Gott wir klagens dir
der Streit ist hier gar bitter.

37
Der Pfister und Ulrich Scheider auch
dazu der Jacob Erni
der Rudolff Bachmann und andere mehr
die ich nicht all kan nennen.

38
Die haben umb der Wahrheit gut
ihr Leben da verschlissen
daran gewendt ihr Hab und Gut
Gott sei es unverwiesen.

39
Sie haben mit wäinen säyen thun
von nun der Herr wird kommen
mit freuden werden sie wieder kon
und bringen ihren Saamen.

40
Die da nicht gar gestorben sind
die haben sie geplaget
auch ihnen graubet Haab und Gut
und auss dem Land verjaget.

41
Dessgleichen zeigt der Esder an
des Herren Wort so klare
wer seinen Ausserwehlten feind
kan man hierbei erfahren.

42
Wo kommt das Ungewitter här
das hast du wohl verstenden
hat nun gewährt etlich tausend Jahr
fast schier in allen Landen

43
Man finds im Buch der Weisheit stahn
dass sie sehr werden klagen
die den Frommen hey Gwalt und Unrecht thon
unds nicht erkennet haben

44
Diss Ungewitter hat in dieser Statt
also viel angefangen
dass ichs nicht vil gelesen hab
dass also sey ergangen.

45
O Herr mein Gott wir bitten dich
thus ihnen nicht zurechnen
weil sie nicht wissen was sie thun
und wider dein Wort fechten.

46

Ich bitt euch alle Weib und Mann
für die das Lied wird kommen
ihr wolt mirs nicht für übel han
und förchten Gottes Nammen.

47

Ich bitt euch alle Jung und alt
die Gott von Hertzen förchten
Ich wünsch dass euch der Herr erhalt
thund auch Gott für mich bitten

48

Dass mich der Herr zu seinem Preiss
biss an das End erhalten
durch seinen Geist mich underweiss
von ihm bleib ungespalten.

49

Der uns das Lied hat new gemacht
von newem hat gesungen
das hat gethan ein alter Mann
Gott woll ihm wenden Kummer. Amen

Hanss Rycher

gedruckt im Jahr Christi 1696

THE VALUE OF HYMNS FOR MENNONITE HISTORY

ERNST CORRELL

It must be regretted that Dr. Neff under the pressure of his editorial work for the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* could not at the moment furnish a more intimate commentary to Hans Rycher's "Zürich Lied." This would necessitate a rather detailed study. While the following notes were written in the library of the University of Chicago where equipment for work in Swiss Anabaptist history is naturally scanty, a few remarks should help to throw light on the background and significance of the "Zürich Lied." In addition an attempt is being made to point to the research value of this type of evidence in a general way.

Much is still to be done by way of a local study of the seventeenth century Zurich Anabaptists. C. Bergmann's *Täuferbewegung im Kanton Zürich bis* 1660, (Leipzig 1916), while in itself incomplete, would at least afford a guide to the original source material. (The University of Chicago Library, in addition to Bergmann's book, possesses an exchange dissertation copy from his pen entitled *Das Schicksal der letzten Täufergemeinden im Kanton Zürich im XVII Jahrhundert* (Zurich, 1916) which, however, contains only chapters IV and V of his entire study on *Die Täuferbewegung,* volume II (V) of the *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte.*)

The "Zürich Lied" inasmuch as it relates the fate of certain Zurich Anabaptists (verses 17-40) is one of the kind of sources which like the *Ausbund,* the *Martyr's Mirror,* and extant letters written by Anabaptists furnish rare original material. As it happened, the particular occurrences in Zurich to which the "Zürich Lied" has reference are told in a special report called *Ein Warhafftiger Bericht von den Brüdern in Schweitzerland, in dem Zürcher Gebiet, wegen der Trübsalen, welche übersie ergangen seyn, um des Evangeliums Willen von dem* 1635*sten bis ins* 1645*ste Jar.* Bergmann, *Täuferbewegung* . . . page VIII, refers to a (printed?) copy (Res. 1036, 3) in the Stadtbibliothek at Zurich, Switzerland, no date. It cannot be the purpose of this supplementary note to investigate into the further bearings which this piece of historical evidence had on the renewed persecution which the Zurich Anabaptists were to suffer in the first half of the 17th century. It seems proper, however, to indicate certain points at least which give the occurrences mentioned a peculiar place not only in Anabaptist history but also on a broader background. What we have before us in the "epic" of the "Zürich Lied" is nothing else but the story of some of the Swiss conscientious objectors during the Thirty Years War.

First concerning the significance of the before-mentioned *War-*

hafftiger Bericht which in a more detailed way includes their story. Hardly any doubt, indeed, is left to infer that this report coincides with one of the original contributions to the last portion of T. van Braght's *Het Bloedig Tooneel of Martelaers Spiegel . . .* , Amsterdam, 1685, volume II, pp. 810-836. Jeremias Mangold, one of the Swiss Brethren, then appears to be its author and the date of its completion is set on September 15, 1645. (Van Braght, II, p. 810.) It is still to be ascertained whether or not the *Warhafftiger Bericht* contains also the one by M. Meyli concluded February, 1658, as being more brief and abrupt in comparison to the Mangold report. (Ibid., II, p. 810.) The two tracts were sent to the editor of the *Martelaers Spiegel* "in de Switsersche tale." T. van Braght states that before this date these reports were circulated among the Dutch Doopsgezinde communities at the request of the suppressed Anabaptists in Switzerland and of their more fortunate brethren in the Palatinate and in the Alsace. They reached the compiler of the *Martelaers Spiegel* in due time to help to bring his catalogue up to date. (Ibid., II, p. 810.) Very carefully, does van Braght in the latter part of the *Martelaers Spiegel* refer his statements concerning the Swiss tribulations to the tracts by Mangold and Meyli.

It was the (Amish?) Mennonites in Pennsylvania who in the first American Germantown *Ausbund* edition of 1742 took it upon them to publish the *Warhafftiger Bericht* in full. (H. S. Bender, *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature,* p. 1. No reference is made to a possibly earlier European Ausbund edition carrying the same appendix.) The inclusion of the *Warhafftiger Bericht* shows a remarkable anticipation by the Pennsylvania Mennonites of their first German edition of the *Martelaers Spiegel,* Ephrata, 1748.

The "Zürich Lied" represents a popular version of some of the outstanding events in the *Warhafftiger Bericht.* It sounds like the testimony of a contemporary witness. Dr. Neff suggested Hans Rycher, the author, a contemporary of the persecutions which is reasonable. Information about Rycher could possibly be gathered from Swiss or Alsatian archives.

As is commonly the case when genuine Anabaptist martyr stories are being tested by other records, the statements made can be verified. A summary list of Swiss 17th century martyrs in the *Martelaers Spiegel* II, page 801, includes the names mentioned in verses 22 and 37 of the "Zürich Lied." Unfortunately Bergmann in his *Täuferbewegung* has only incomplete and in some respects obscure references to names. However, some of these martyrs in the "Zürich Lied" and the event itself check up with Bergmann's description based on official sources. Of Felix Landis (verse 22), one of the victims of starvation in the Zurich penitentiary, the *Martelaers Spiegel* II, page 820, reports him to have been the son of Hans Landis. The latter in 1614 was the last of the Swiss Anabaptists to be beheaded. Compare the various sources on Landis in Correll, *Schweizerisches Täufer-Mennonitentum,* page 63). Bergmann, *Ibid.,* pp 101 ff, gives details on the methods of persecution, expropriation, starvation, etc.; methods of persecution which correspond to those indicated in the "Zürich Lied."

What about the deeper significance of the events themselves? As in-

dicated, they appear on the background of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) when especially the state of Zurich tried to become an ally to the Protestant group. In accordance with this aim the Zurich government under the influence of its Zwinglian Bishop (Antistes) Breitinger mobilized and trained her man-power. On that occasion strong and most disturbing opposition arose in certain quarters of the Zurich territory—they were clearly of Anabaptist origin. While the authorities had been satisfied that the Anabaptist trouble was in the main done away with by the heavy persecutions during the 16th century and in the first two decades of the 17th century—the 1630's showed the contrary to be true. Breitinger and his aims in the foreign policy of Zurich became quite upset. The intense efforts to quiet down the Anabaptist protest, the various methods applied by the city council finally leading to the severe punishment of the conscientious objectors so vividly described in the "Zürich Lied" form a significant chapter in the history of the Swiss Anabaptists. Next came the interposition by the Dutch government, the Mennonite subjects of which having called for help and protection in regard to their persecuted fellow-believers in Zurich and Bern. It was the above mentioned *Warhhafftiger Bericht* that served as one of the evidences in that conflict which finally paved the way for the half voluntary exodus of the Swiss Anabaptists, their migration to more tolerant German states and to Pennsylvania at the end of the 17th century which last century of persecution rings in the "Zürich Lied."

This cannot be the place to go into further detail. The background of the "Zürich Lied" appears clear. Further information about its very occurrences can be gathered from still unpublished and rarely used archives deposited at the *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek* in Munich, Germany, entitled: *Aktenstücke, Brief, u. s. w. die Täufer (Wiedertäufer zu Zürich)* betr., ca. 1640, Molliana-Sammlung, Ana 14, 40. (Department of Manuscript Collections of the State Library.) It should also be mentioned in this connection that more definite information about the conditions of the Swiss Anabaptists in that particular period can be found in Christine von Hoiningen-Hühne's, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen der Schweiz und Holland,* Berlin, 1888, pp. 63 ff, an extended copy of her Doctor's thesis. (For other data see Chapter IV on "Die Schweizerischen Täufer im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert," Correll, *Ibid.,* pp. 54-75.

It is to be hoped that the publication by Dr. Neff of a Zurich hymn will stimulate studies on 17th century Zurich Anabaptists which in comparison to the Berne Anabaptists offer a rather neglected field. In addition to E. Müller's *Geschichte der bernischen Täufer,* Frauenfeld, 1895, Dr. Adolf Fluri has done the very kind of research still to be applied to the Zurich territory. He has especially endeavored to investigate the type of testimony of which Dr. Neff gives the Zurich example. Dr. Fluri's studies will be of suggestive value. See, for example, his "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bernischen Täufer" in *Blätter für Bernische Geschichte,* 1912.

The hymns of the Anabaptists, whether they are more of an ecclesiastical or more of a descriptive character are a very remarkable source-material indeed. Mention should be made in this connection of The

Mennonite Quarterly Review, April, 1929 issue containing Professor A. J. Ramaker's study on "Hymns and Hymn Writers among the Anabaptists" (giving further literature on the subject) and H. S. Bender's report on his find of the first European *Ausbund* edition of 1564. The same issue contains another interesting poetical source on the Swiss Anabaptists about 1800 produced by Georg Schwertfeger, a non-Mennonite. Consultation should also be made of H. S. Bender's *Bibliography,* 1929. Since English translations of Anabaptist hymns are rarely rendered, reference is made to a few of the *Ausbund* pieces reproduced in H. S. Burrage's *Baptist Hymn Writers and their Hymns,* Portland, Maine, 1888. Wolkan's *Lieder der Wiedertäufer,* Berlin, 1903, offers the first scientific discussion of the subject. The classical pattern of the "Zürich Lied" to which Dr. Neff refers can be found translated in the first English edition of the *Martyrer Spiegel* published in Elkhart, Indiana, 1886, pp. 1069, 1070. See also Neff's article "Gesangbücher," in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* volume I.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that Anabaptist hymns are a subject of investigation also in other fields. Preeminently students of folklore have always taken delight in such productions. Language and literary scholars have never ceased to investigate the "non-literary" portion which most of the Anabaptist hymns constitute in the field of Christian hymnody. Their essential existence of course is part and parcel of Anabaptist-Mennonite history proper. In themselves they are the very record of its martyrology, many of them even being a personal testimony of those who died for the cause. Bossert, Loserth, Hege, Neff and other scholars contributed many a biography on *Ausbund* poets to the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* proving again the remarkable quality of the hymns as a source material to be tapped from almost any angle. Official Swiss documents, to which Bergmann's before mentioned study has references, indicate how the hymns themselves became victims of the persecution. Political authorities apprehended them as danger-carriers, prohibited their distribution and constables were ordered to seize and destroy the song booklets. This included the *Ausbund* and collections of the kind from which Dr. Neff presents the "Zürich Lied." The same observations concerning the significance of Anabaptist hymns and their fate can be made in regard to the Dutch and the Hutterian (communistic) Anabaptists. The latter were especially prolific in hymn productions. Many of these hymns for centuries were sung from manuscripts. In 1914 a large collection of Hutterian hymns appeared as *Die Lieder der Hutterischen Brüder* in Scottdale, Pennsylvania. No historian of the Hutterites can afford to neglect a study of their hymnology.

Certain problems in Anabaptist-Mennonite history could not find a better solution than can readily be inferred from the very hymns of the various groups. There is, for example, no securer information on the strictly Biblical orientation of their belief. Such proof because of its democratic character is more impressive than any intelligently drafted confesson of faith. The fate that accompanied their faith and practice is measured up with examples and prophecies of the Scriptures, their only source of encouragement. Certain hymns were even vehicles of ethical

admonitions. These provide the student of to-day with unmistakable suggestions concerning economic ethics for which literary proof is hard if not impossible to find. (See such "Poetical" evidence on self-sufficient Anabaptist economy taken from Dr. Fluri's studies by Correll, *Schweizerisches Täufer-Mennonitentum,* 1925, pages 58 ff.) In no way do the Anabaptist hymns, as is occasionally superficially suggested, indicate radical social teachings other than conscientious objection. They are "non-political," plainly pious in their very nature.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

Peter Cheltschizki, Ein Prophet an der Wende der Zeiten. Von Carl Vogl. Zurich and Leipzig: Rotapfel Verlag. 1926. pp. 269.

Who has ever heard of Peter of Cheltschiz in Bohemia, contemporary of Huss, a prophet of the gospel of the Reformation 100 years before Luther, the forerunner of all those since his time who have had the faith and courage sufficient to dedicate themselves to living out the gospel and teachings of Christ in all their purity, a preacher who dared to condemn the use of force in any form and insist on love as the essence of all true life in God? The voice of Peter Cheltschizki has been lost for a half millenium; today but a handful of historical specialists know that he ever existed, yet anyone who reads the summary of his teachings together with the brief sketch and characterization by Carl Vogl under the above title and has any sympathy at all for pure Christianity will recognize that in this humble Bohemian of 500 years ago the world and the church have a prophet of tremendous power with a message that is sorely needed in all ages but especially in our generation. It is to be regretted that Vogl's book has not yet been translated into the English and that therefore Peter Cheltschizki will not be accessible to many of the readers of these lines. For that reason a more extensive survey of the book will be given than is usually presented in a review, a survey which is particularly justifiable in the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW because of the spiritual affinity between Peter Cheltschizki and the Anabaptists of the Reformation period as well as the Mennonites of today. The survey which follows is chiefly a condensation of Vogl's own words, not the critique of the writer.

When the Bohemians (ca. 1420) arose in their might to maintain their faith against the invading imperial hosts which had been sent on a crusade by Pope Martin V to wipe out the Hussite heretics, they won victory after victory by force of arms under Cizka and other great leaders. In the midst of the strife one voice alone arose to protest against force and bloodshed, the voice of a common man, Peter of Cheltschiz in southern Bohemia. "Even if Peter himself would come down from heaven and teach us to use force to defend the faith I would not believe," was his cry. Very little is known of Peter save that he was a man of such conviction and courage that he could stand immovable against the whole world of his day and remain true to his convictions. He was a younger contemporary of John Huss, a peasant farmer, freeman, no priest, no scholar, no university student, no monk. Nothing is known of his birth, family, marriage or death. The period of his activity was roughly 1420-1460.

After spending the years 1419 and 1420 in Prague where he was the only apostle of nonresistance in the midst of war, he retired per-

manently to his village, though not to resign in quiet solitude from the life of his day. He began a series of important writings, always with the one leading theme, Christ's requirement of nonresistance and love and His prohibition of killing and the use of even making of law by Christians. The great battle, said Peter, is not with human enemies but with the mighty powers of darkness. His first writing appeared in 1421, entitled *On Spiritual Warfare* (*Vom Geistigen Kampf*), in which he went so far as to reject the Pope and his Church as Anti-Christ. His next work, *On the Christian Church* (*Von der heiligen Kirche*), consisted of a proof that force and the Gospel are irreconcilable, and was directed against the Taborites who were very active in the religious warfare of the day. In this work he also argued against the three-fold division of the society into priests, lords, and commons. In reply to a challenge by one of the Taborite leaders for a clearer exposition on this point he wrote *On the Three Classes* (*Vom Dreierlei Volk*), probably in 1426, in which he particularly attacked the second class, the lords, as the worldly authority operating by force. The authority of force was necessary among the heathen he admitted, but among Christians the law of love alone was to operate and there was no room for strife, war, lawsuits, and penalties. The true Church of Christ had nothing to do with such things, things which were imported into the Church first by Emperor Constantine and which had been the cause of degeneration ever since. Further, the third class, the commons, should not be subject to the other two and be required to support them by the fruit of their miserable labor; all should share life and support one another.

Two other important works came from Peter's pen. The one, called **Postille,** was a collection of 59 sermons on the gospel pericopes of the church year, written about 1434. The other, one of the most important of his writings, called *The Net of Faith* was a symbolical title based on the miracle which occurred when Peter at the Lord's command cast out his net and took in a multitude of fish. Peter of Cheltschiz tells us that at that time two great and devilish whales got into the net (the Church) along with the fish, namely the emperor and the pope. Since then the church had been a degenerate body, in which the law of love and humility had been disregarded and the law of force set up. As a consequence of this degeneration, various wicked groups in society and church, such as the lords, the citizens of the town, the monks, the priests, the university men, had misused their power to plunder the common folk, persecute the true Christians, fill the world with strife and war, cheat men of their true salvation by deceiving them into outward forms of religion and leading them away from the true God. In fact, says Peter, they had made out of the church a church of Antichrist which would be cursed on the day of damnation. This tremendous work was really discovered in modern times by Tolstoi. It is Peter's best. A number of smaller books were written about the same time, *St. Paul's Teaching on the Old Man; On the Workers in the Lord's Vineyard;* and *Commentary on the Passion According to John.* Later he wrote a *Reply to Rokyzana* (Rokyzana was Archbishop of the Utraquists) and a *Reply to Nicho-*

las of Pilgram (Nicholas was a Taborite bishop), both written about 1450. Four other minor writings have been preserved, *Discussion of the Divine Body* (dealing with the Sacrament); *On the Beast; On the Foundation of Human Law;* and *On Purgatory. Most* of Peter's works were published for the first time a hundred years later.

Written in a vigorous, beautiful, original style (Czechish), Peter's writings are sincere flaming protests, the calls of a prophet with a might sense of mission. In them no theologian, no philosopher speaks, no one concerned with teachings and institutions, but one concerned with life, an Old Testament prophet with a conquering vision of the new life of the Gospel.

The historian is naturally interested in origins. Whence did Peter draw his message? It is clear that he was influenced most by the Waldenses and John Wiclif, though he was not a Waldensian as Goll claims. That he was very near to the Waldenses is proved by the fact that in 1468 the Bohemian Brethren, children of his spirit, called in the Austrian Waldensian Bishop Stephen to ordain their priests. However there is not sufficient material at hand to show how much influence the Waldenses exerted on Peter. Although he read the important writings of Wiclif, Peter opposed Wiclif's views because Wiclif and the Taborites favored the use of force by rulers. For the same reason he opposed the teachings of Huss. It is clear that although Peter may have been influenced to some extent by all these men and parties, yet he belonged to no man nor party; he was his own leader. He was an independent, radical, revolutionary original thinker, towering high above his contemporaries and his age, a man for all peoples and all ages.

What were the fruits of Peter's work? At first there arose a small group or community of Cheltschizki Brethren, out of whom developed the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren of a later date. It was not long however until the Brethren began to lose much of the original message of Peter, and in time even his name was forgotten. In modern times interest in Peter has been revived by no less a man than the greatest of modern Czechs, T. G. Masaryk, president of the republic of Czechoslovakia. In a recent address Masaryk presented Peter as his ideal of the modern Czech, the hero of Czech youth along with Huss. However the modern Czechs who idolize Peter see in him only the ethical and omit the religious, although it was the religious element, his faith in God and love for God which was the heart of Peter's life and message.

The heart of Vogl's book lies in the presentation of the message of Peter of Cheltschiz which occupies the greater part of the volume, and it is this message which is much more important than the details of the man's career, much as such information might be desired. In order to clarify Peter's message, Vogl has summarized the cardinal points under three main themes, society (Von der Welt Art), life in God, and sacraments or means of grace (die Heiltuemer). A brief summary of Vogl's presentation will serve better than anything else to acquaint the reader with Peter and his work.

On Society. Peter had a strong social sense, a passion for the high calling of the common folk, the fourth estate, who were despised by the dominant social classes of his day. In irresistible and powerful exposition which at times becomes very bitter, he attacks and exposes one after the other the nobles, the burgers, the monks, the priests and pastors, and the theologians of the university. The so-called "honor" according to which the nobility were supposed to act in the age of chivalry he tears to pieces with unmatched satire, and the nobility he discloses as shameful plunderers and oppressors. The worst sin of the spiritual classes is their hypocrisy, by which they commercialize and destroy spiritual relationships turning them into means of oppression. While the oppressed common folk are compelled to slave to support these classes in all their wealth and luxury, they themselves are oppressed, deceived, shamed and exploited in a double way, for they lose both soul and body. As Vogl remarks here, one who knows the world of today cannot help but feel that Peter's charges can also be raised against our modern society, which suffers under a social order in which the few oppress the many, deceive them into obedience with false claims of honor and patriotism, and are able to depend on the church for endorsement of their lordship, a society which is losing both body and soul to the forces of destruction.

In connection with the attack on the social order of his day, Peter finds in war and fighting one of the basic causes of all wickedness. He shows that war is evil in essence and that therefore all its fruits must be evil no matter how apparently pious the intents of those who participate. (One must remember here that the war Peter particularly had in mind was that of the oppressed Bohemians fighting for their faith, certainly a noble motive if there ever was one for a war). Everywhere Peter bases his message on the New Testament. He shows that when Christians try to drive out the devil by killing their wicked enemies, the devil comes into their own hearts now become cruel and unloving, where they will never be able to find him and drive him out.

The heart of Peter's chief writing, *The Net of Faith,* is a great and successful polemic against those who defend war, in particular the theologians and church fathers who attempt to defend war from the Scriptures. The rout of these hypocrites is complete, as it must ever be. It might profit our moderns who think it necessary to still the biting voice of conscience by an interpretation of the Scriptures in favor of war to read Peter Cheltschizki. In bitter irony he describes the warring groups into which society is split up, all bent on defending noble causes of one sort or another and then says: "And all these call themselves Christians, and unitedly call upon God as 'Our Father who art in Heaven'. All come out on the Lord's side and demonstrate their loyalty to God by destroying their fellowmen, supposing to serve God by drenching the earth with the blood of other children of God. And they continually pray in unison 'Forgive us as we forgive one another', yet each one tries to collect as large a company of warriors as possible, and never thinks of forgiv-

ing even those nearest to him. Therefore their prayers are the greatest blasphemy . . . . They cannot pray for one another, for each prays for his own soldier with the intent that they destroy the other . . . . In short, each one who has the power to fight tries to demonstrate by faith and religion his right to fight and use his might. Whereas if they should try to defend themselves by this means without the might to back up their arguments, no one would believe their treacherous assertions, for all know full well that they cannot prove their claims by faith in Christ, without the force of might to compel agreement."

In addition to the general attack on the principle of force behind all war, Peter points out the evils that flow from war and act as degenerative forces in society. From this point he goes on to attack the other evils in the world which destroy men, pride of life and clothes, love of luxury, lust, etc. Peter is not a sentimental optimist believing that all is well in the world and that men are after all good. He recognizes all the evil in the world, but does not shrink back one bit on this account. He attacks the evils all the harder because they are powerful and mighty, and points out their contrast to the Christian way of life. It would be hard to imagine a more powerful presentation of the contrast between the way of the world and the life of the Christian, life in God.

Life in God. Under this heading Vogl summarizes Peter's message regarding the inner spiritual life of the Christian, his relation to God, and its outworking in his relation to his fellowmen. According to Vogl, Peter brings what Luther brought a hundred years later, only he brings it in a purer and more finished form, the purest and truest Christianity. Peter has caught the essence of Christ's teachings, the essence of the Gospel, and brings the same to his fellows without weakening its force in any way, in the flame of a sacred earnestness. He compels men to listen to Christ as He is, to face the decision of obedience or disobedience to the Master. This is what makes Peter a prophet.

Faith is the heart of Peter's life and of his "system," a living faith that is born out of God's grace and love and expresses itself in love to God and love to man. Both faith and love Peter conceives as gifts from God which are naturally without compulsion bound to express themselves in a life of holiness and mercy, a life of natural obedience to God because the Christian is a child of God, born out of His nature. But one is acceptable in God's sight only by faith (like Luther) and its fruit, love. The great thing in the Christian life, (according to Vogl who sees here an advance over Luther) is a faith-produced love. This love is the only law according to which the Christian can live in the world. Here Peter is radically different from Luther, who sees two laws according to which the Christian may live in the world, namely the law of the world which is force, and the law of the Christian which is love. Peter sees well that the law of the world is force, but he is unwilling (in contrast to Luther) to permit the Christian to obey this law of force. Luther makes

man a two-fold being, a son of God and a member of the society of this world; he accepts the "historical situation", compromises with "the world", permits the Christian to obey both laws, and thus loses the chance to create a new world. Peter is here the consistent Christian, the consistent evangelical, the follower of Christ. Luther draws the consequences and justifies the existing social order, war and all. Peter meets all the stock arguments from the Scripture in justification of war, including those of Luther, in particular the statements in Luke 3:14, Romans 13:1, and I Timothy 2:1-3. In the process Peter refutes Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Albertus Magnus, and a host of other church fathers and schoolmen, whose sophistry he tears to shreds. He goes still further and denies the place in a *Christian* society of either state or church in their institutional form as then known. This does not mean that Peter advocates anarchy, the destruction of state and church, for he recognizes that the non-Christian cannot live without the state. But he insists that the state is of the world order. Hence a "Christian state" is a contradiction of terms, a patent hypocrisy. The worst crime of all, logically then, is the mingling of church and state, which ruins both. Property itself is not denied by Peter, but he does condemn any form of property which enslaves and impoverishes a brother or enslaves the soul of its possessor. The sincere application of this position would go far toward destroying the institution of private property.

Throughout Peter's discussion of the entire social question, war, the question of the nature of state and church, etc., there is nothing narrow, sectarian, legalistic, fanatical. He constantly takes his stand on great principles, basic truths, from which he draws his applications to the problems of his day. He is a prophet, not a disciplinarian. He challenges an inner life in God, not an outward obedience to a law. Nor is he a mystic in the classical sense, although he has a mystical spirit, a deep knoweldge of the meaning of union with God, the life in the spirit.

The sacraments or means of grace. It is in the matter of the sacraments that Peter Cheltschizki is most bound to his Catholic traditions. Yet even here he had won a large measure of liberty. He acknowledges only three sacraments, baptism, the Lord's supper, the penance. He almost succeeds in recognizing these three forms as mere symbols, yet he does not reach the point of rejecting infant baptism and transubstantiation. He attacks the magical, superstitious use of these forms so strongly however, that it seems impossible that he should have withheld himself from the symbolical view. He denies purgatory altogether. He abolishes the hierarchy but does not do away with the priesthood entirely as did Luther later, though he greatly reduces their importance in the true church. He condemns as heathenish the worship of saints and relics, and rejects prayers to the saints. In short he abandons everything which was characteristic of the Roman Catholic idea of the church, including the hierarchy, and calls for a church of the believing faithful, spiritualized, obedient, living the life of Christ over again in the midst of a perverse world.

The brief sketch of Peter's message which Vogl brings is interspersed with a great number of extracts from Peter's writings, so that one is brought face to face with the man himself, and not a mere secondhand description. At least half of the book is composed of these quotations. This is a feature which makes the work especially valuable. As an appendix Vogl presents a sermon of Peter and one of Luther on the same text, Luke 16:19-31.

Today perhaps very few would have practical interest in Peter Cheltschizki. To most he is an interesting historical figure, attractive, worthy of recognition no doubt, but impractical, impossible in his message. Possibly so, but what about the teaching and message of Christ. The same can be said of the Gospel he brought. Was it not the case in Jesus' time, that the practical folk, the realistic thinkers, were the ones who had ears to hear but could not hear, and concerning whom Jesus said he would teach in forms which they could not understand. Impractical in this present world, yes; so may we characterize the message of Peter of Cheltschiz, just as we must characterize the message of his Master, Jesus of Nazareth. But it was not meant to be practical in this age, this world order. The world of the vision of Christ is not a mere working over of the old world, that would be impossible and impractical. It is a new world, which comes down out of heaven from God, and breaks through upon men, a complete change of heart and mind, a metamorphosis, a new creation. For the eyes which are "holden" this new world is invisible, impossible.

What would have happened in Bohemia if the people had accepted Peter's message and followed the principle of love and nonresistance instead of laying hold on force? For a time they were victorious as warriors, but in the end, after the Thirty Years' War, they lost their national life, their faith, and their culture. What they sought to save they lost. What Peter sought to give them they never received because they rejected it. So is it today. Our modern world is losing what it is seeking by worldly means to gain, and what it could have by simple faith and love in life with Christ in God it cannot receive because it rejects its Master.

Let the final word be a beautiful paragraph from Peter's *Netz des Glaubens.*

> And the law of God is one and forms a unity of such goodness and loving-kindness that it can receive the greatest multitude of men, so that all could become one. If only the world would have faith in the law of God and obey it, all could be one in Christ, for this law leads men so that each takes his place in parity with his brother, loves the other as himself, bears his brother's burden and does to all others as he would wish for himself. And this would make possible that out of thousands of worlds unity should come, one heart and one soul. Hence there can be no better word for mankind as it journeys along its way in this worldly pilgrimage, for this word will lead men into the truest life and make them most pleasing to God and a benefit to each other, so that each one will become a second self to his brother.

It is deeply worth while to meet Peter of Cheltschiz and Carl Vogl deserves our gratitude for making the meeting possible. We

await with anticipation the translation of Peter's writings which he has undertaken, and of which the first volume, *Netz des Glaubens,* has already appeared. It is to be hoped that someone will be found to make these translations accessible to the English-speaking world as well.

Harold S. Bender.

Die Qüaker in der Deutschen Vergangenheit. Von Wilhelm Hubben. Leipzig: Quäker-Verlag. 1929. pp. 202.

The Quaker movement was in its early years intensely missionary. In addition to capturing tens of thousands of adherents in England in the turbulent Cromwellian and Restoration period from 1647 to 1685, the followers of George Fox went everywhere abroad preaching a revival of the old gospel with unquenchable enthusiasm and a sense of mission that lent authority to their message. In 1656 the first missionaries came to the British colonies in North America. Soon thereafter they were to be found in Holland, Germany, Poland, Italy, Egypt, Syria and Palestine, the West Indies, before the sultan in Constantinople and before the pope in Rome. In spite of bitter persecution almost everywhere the Quaker apostles persisted in their testimony. It is remarkable that in spite of the high quality of their work, and their tenacity, so slight permanent results were achieved. With a few notable exceptions, within a half century the traces of Quakerism on the continent had practically disappeared, although the term "Quaker" persisted in the popular theological vocabulary much longer as a term of opprobrium for religious fanaticism of a peculiarly reprehensible sort.

The story of Quakerism in Germany is but a segment of this larger history. Wilhelm Hubben, editor of the German Quaker monthly, *Monatshefte der Deutschen Freunde,* has gathered the scattered bits of this story and told a simple tale of the testimony to the truth by the Quaker apostles in Germany past and present which forms a welcome addition to the history of Quakerism in general as well as to the religious history of Germany in the century after the Thirty Years' War. After a brief sketch of the early history of Quakerism he traces the beginnings in Germany, particularly in relation to Labadism, pietism, and quietism. This is followed by an account of the Quaker communities formed in the five cities of Kriegsheim, Emden, Hamburg, Danzig, and Friedrichstadt. An essential part of this account is the story of the emigration of the Kriegsheim group and the earlier smaller company at Crefeld to Pennsylvania.

After a century another episode in Quaker missionary activity brings the story of two very small groups at Minden and Pyrmont in northwestern Germany, both drawn from pietistic circles, and both of which lived a scant generation after their establishment about 1790. Another century and another brings its story, the beautiful story of the Quaker child-feeding mission in Germany from 1920 to 1925, with a fresh founding of a small Quaker group.

Although conditions in Germany were frequently quite favorable

to the work of the Quaker missionaries Hubben's account makes it quite clear that a truly indigenous, self-sustaining Quaker movement was never brought to life in Germany. Although the meetings of the Quaker apostles were at times attended by hundreds, scarcely more than a dozen families at one place ever actually joined the movement. The small groups which were started were very dependent on the frequent visits of friends from England and America, as well as on their financial assistance. In nearly every case where meeting houses were acquired or erected the English Friends provided the necessary funds. Indeed at times the few members who remained faithful were in need of direct support to maintain even physical existence. After the first accessions new members were very seldom acquired, and with the death or emigration of the original families the remaining traces of a noble attempt vanished.

With one or two exceptions it is quite doubtful whether the Quaker emissaries would have had any success at all had it not been for the fact that the similarity of their message to the teachings of the Mennonites gave them entrance in many communities. In fact, every one of their early communities was founded in Mennonite communities and was composed almost exclusively of converts from the Mennonite profession. This is true of Crefeld, Kriegsheim, Emden, Hamburg, Danzig, and Friedrichstadt. The most serious inroad made upon any of the Mennonite congregations was at Hamburg where the noted preacher Berend Roelofs with eleven members left the Mennonites to join the Friends. Although there was much ground for sympathetic fellowship between the two groups, the success of the Quakers in attracting and winning supporters in Mennonite circles naturally provoked resentment, and an interesting aspect of the relationship between the two groups is the ensuing controversy which arose, and which led at least two Mennonite preachers, Gerhard Roosen in Hamburg and Hinrich Cassel in Gerolsheim (near Kriegsheim in the Palatinate), to issue pamphlets attacking the Quakers.

Typical of the attitude of the Quaker missionaries to the Mennonites is the note in Thomas Chalkley's journal written in 1709, "In Holland and Germany lives a great people which is very near to the truth, among many of whom the fields are ripe to harvest". One cannot help but feel the contrast in spirit between the Quakers and the Mennonites. The latter thought of nothing but quietly going about their work in their little world, as unobtrusive as possible, in meek obedience to their overlords in every possible point, humbly petitioning for the most elemental human rights as grants of mercy. Missionary activity was farthest from their thought. They were simple folk, "die Stillen in Lande". In contrast the Quaker apostles were flaming prophets, zealous, afraid of no man, demanding of the princes and lords with whom they came in conflict the rights and liberties due a Christian man. Most of them were in a certain sense men of the world and men of affairs, learned, successful in business and commerce, widely-traveled, wealthy.

Two of the Quaker apostles of the early period are of especial interest to Mennonites and of especial importance in Quaker history in Germany. The first was William Ames. Ames was a great traveler, and the real founder of the Quaker groups in the Mennonite centers in west Germany. As a result of his visits a small group was established at Kriegsheim in 1656, one in Emden in 1662, one in Hamburg in 1659, and one in Danzig in 1661. Whether he was responsible for the group in Friedrichstadt which arose about the same time is not clear. Ames was the most industrious and perhaps the most effective of all the Quaker missionaries on the continent. A decade later William Penn, who had himself joined the movement only in 1667, rendered noble service to the cause in his travels among the newly established Quaker groups in Germany and elsewhere. For Mennonites Penn's relations to these groups and their Mennonite neighbors in Germany is of especial interest because of the fact that the first Mennonite settlements in the new world, those at Germantown and Skippack, were doubtless the result of these earlier visits of Penn.

It is interesting to learn that at a time when the Mennonites had practically won their liberties the Quakers were subjected to the most severe persecution, especially in Emden and Hamburg. The story of the brutal persecutions in Emden is touching. The difference in the attitude of the authorities is to be accounted for by the fact that the Mennonites were non-missionary, and a known quantity, while the Quakers were newcomers, a danger to the established order. Enlightening is Hubben's frequent note that as long as the persecutions continued the new Quaker groups were enabled to exist and maintain a warm inner life, but that with toleration they lost their vitality and died out. Since the toleration began about 1685, and the disappearance of the groups followed soon after, the conclusion is probably justified. This means that a brief period of thirty years covers the active phase of early Quaker history in Germany, 1660-1690. If it is remembered that in none of the groups in this period did the membership ever exceed a half dozen families, altogether at one time probably not over fifty persons, it is clear that the extent of the movement was quite limited. It is to be viewed as a temporary missionary enterprise of the English Quakers.

The chapter on the emigration to Pennsylvania is of especial interest to Mennonites. Although Hubben brings little new material, the account is valuable as a fresh up to date narration, from a new point of view. The data are drawn chiefly from the pertinent Quaker journals and the writings of Pennypacker, Correll, Kapp, Seidensticker, etc. A German translation of the 1688 Germantown protest against slavery is included. We learn that the entire Quaker community in Kriegsheim as well as the small group in Crefeld had emigrated to Pennsylvania by 1686. The Crefeld Quakers were among the first thirteen families who founded Germantown in 1683, while the five families in the Kriegsheim group migrated in 1685. It would have been of value had the author been able to fix the names of the families involved in the movement, since this would

enable the fixing of the names of the Mennonite families in the emigration. According to Hubben only six of the original thirteen purchasers were Mennonites, the rest being Quakers, while all but one of these six had joined the Quakers by 1692. If this is the case, historians are scarcely justified in calling Germantown a Mennonite settlement. The facts in this matter should be verified before a definite conclusion is drawn. The historical specialist might desire more detailed data at various points in the book, but as the author indicates in the introduction, the work is a production of the spare time of a busy editor. As it is, Hubben has presented us with a well-written and very valuable account of the history of the Quaker movement in Germany, one that has a particular value for the Mennonite historian because of the intimate association of Quakers and Mennonites in the earlier phases of this history.

Question might be raised about a few minor points. On page 28 Galenus Abrahams de Haan, the noted Mennonite preacher of Amsterdam is called "a leaders of the Collegiants, formerly a Mennonite". Galenus remained Mennonite to his death. On page 74 are found the names of "three Quakers" who in 1919 visited the families of the German prisoners of war who had been ministered to by the Friends relief unit in France. Among these names is that of Solomon Yoder, who however was at that time and still is a Mennonite. On page 158 in a note reference is made to the "many Mennonites in Waldeck" about 1790. There was a Mennonite (Amish) settlement in Waldeck but the number of families was never very large.

Harold S. Bender.

The Red Hills: A Record of Good Days Outdoors and In With Things Pennsylvania Dutch. By CORNELIUS WEYGANDT. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1929. pp. xvi, 251.

This book comes to us in a two-tone jacket, alluringly reminiscent in its red-and-yellow of the tastes of the folk so graphically pictured between its covers. Its familiar farmyard scene, against a background of rolling red hills, is highly suggestive of Pennsylvania Dutchland among the red hills of Pennsylvania.

Professor Weygandt, himself a Pennsylvania German by birth, and thoroughly familiar with the customs and characteristics of his own people, is well fitted to give a vivid and understanding account of these folk. He keeps us conscious of his sympathetic attitude by the frequent use of the first person pronoun, identifying himself with the people as a group. Thus: "We found our way to rich land as if by instinct;" "red, we love wherever it may be;" "The 'Dutch' we speak—;" "our interest in the peacock—." Mr. Weygandt's evident and sincere enjoyment of the loveliness of Dutch countrysides, of the quaint beauty of Dutch pottery, of the homely worth of Dutch character, in short, of the appeal of all things Dutch, contributes much to the charm and spontaneity of the book.

The Dutchland which the author knows so well lies chiefly among the red hills of the southeastern counties of Pennsylvania, from Chester

to Franklin, from Bucks to Mifflin, but he has also tracked out its overflow to other parts. From this center the "Dutch" people, who, it must be remembered, came not from Holland, but from the upper Rhine valley in Germany, have scattered north and south and west, but particularly west. West have they gone as far as California, leaving substantial communities along the way in Ohio, Iowa, Nebraska, and elsewhere. But the hills of Pennsylvania remain the center of their culture. The Mennonites, Amish, and other plain sects of their number receive a due share of recognition and comment throughout the volume, along with their kinsfolk of other denominations. The particular talent of the "plain clothes people," according to Professor Weygandt, is exhibited in the farm products which they display at the curb markets, and in their universal kindliness and uprightness of heart.

We are told, in a racy style which casts a glamour over all it touches, of many things characteristic of the Dutch country and Dutch people. In rapid and colorful panorama we look upon prosperous farms amid the rolling hills, curb markets piled high with products of farm and home, gentians in a carpet of blue by the roadside, red coxcombs and orange marigolds abloom in the door yards, and the dying glow of the sunset through the mountains. We take shelter from a summer shower in the barn fragrant with new hay, from which we watch the storm, undisturbed and secure in the knowledge that we are protected from the lightning by four tulip and pomegranate symbols painted on the outside of the barn. We pass before the mouth of a cave where a typical, fire-breathing, medieval dragon has his lair. We share in Gargantuan feasts, taking "three helps" of everything, including seven sours and seven sweets. We witness the magic of the powwow doctor and of the "hex." We marvel at the exquisite artistry and exact skill of the old flute-maker, the potter, and even the shingle maker. We welcome the Easter dawn with a blare of trombones, and ceremonies oddly suggestive of the Persian, as are many other things among the Dutch, according to our author.

Then the author surrenders himself with joyous abandon to his enthusiasm for Dutchiana. Through six chapters he leads us merrily along the trail of old pottery, of redware, glazed and unglazed, plain, or decorated with yellow slip, of spatterware in blues and greens and pinks. We follow the peacock, tulip, pomegranate, and deer, as household favorites, as mystic symbols, as motives on china, quilts, samples, rugs, and wood carving. Piece by piece we examine the author's extensive collection. We learn the exact dimensions of each redware jug, the exact position of the peacocks on each spatterware cup, every detail of design on each yellow slipped plate; and all with a surprising variety and freshness of style. To the uninitiated, some of this wealth of detail becomes a trifle lengthy and tedious, but to those versed in the lore of old pottery and wood carving it must be fascinating indeed.

While Mr. Weygandt candidly admits the lack of taste and artistic beauty in much of this art so dear to the heart of the Dutch, he yet brings out its meaning and quaint appeal in such a telling way that one cannot help sharing his enthusiasm for be-peacocked cups, be-tuliped plates, and red and yellow flowers in the door yard. Especially if one is also

of the blood, is there an answering longing that is almost a heartache to go along back to "Bickel's in May" and revel again in the unrestrained pleasures of awakening springtime in a simple, kindly farm home, among wild flowers and birds and tree-clad hills.

There have been other authors who have written of things Pennsylvania Dutch, but this volume is not to be compared with the efforts of short story writers whose concern it is to exploit the oddities of certain sects or localities in unthinking exaggeraton. Professor Weygandt depicts the culture of a people who have brought with them from the old world ancient and meaningful customs and crafts. That the significance of this culture has been so little recognized adds the more value to this book, making it a worthy addition for the book shelves, especially of those who claim this heritage.

Ruth Bender.